



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1995

No. 61

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, March 27, 1995)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Lord of creation, You have written Your signature in the bursting beauty of this magnificent spring morning in our Nation's Capital. The breathtaking splendor of the cherry blossoms blankets the city with fairyland wonder. The daffodils and crocuses have opened to express Your glory. Now Lord, tune our hearts to join with all of nature in singing Your praise.

We thank You for the rebirth of hope that comes with this season of renewal. You remind us, "Behold I make all things new!" As the seeds and bulbs have germinated in the earth, so You have prepared us to burst forth in newness of life. We forget the former things and claim Your new beginning for us. Help us to accept Your forgiveness and be giving and forgiving people. Clean out the hurting memories of our hearts so that we may be open channels of Your vibrant, creative spirit as we tackle problems and grasp the possibilities of this day.

Lord, we want to live this day in the flow of Your grace. We put You and truth first, our Nation and its future second, and our party third. Help us not to reverse the order. For the sake of the future of our beloved Nation and by Your power. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. President.

SCHEDULE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this morning the leader time has been reserved. There will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak up to 5 minutes each.

At 12 noon today, following ascertaining a quorum, a cloture vote will occur on the conference report to accompany H.R. 831, the Self-Employed Health Insurance Act. Additional roll-call votes are expected throughout the day today.

Also, as a reminder to all Senators, Members should be in their seats at 2:15 tomorrow for the official photograph of the 104th Congress.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 12 noon with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

UCONN NCAA NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, for those who have followed NCAA basket-

ball this year, not only through the sports pages and TV and radio coverage, but through the statements of various Members of this Chamber, I did not want to disappoint my colleagues by not rushing to the floor this morning to express my pride at the extraordinary victory of the University of Connecticut women's basketball team in defeating Tennessee yesterday and claiming the national championship.

Mr. President, there is a part of me that wants to do a Dick Vitale impersonation here on the floor—raise the voice, shake the hands—but I am going to abide by the rules of appropriate discourse, at least in this Chamber, and simply say with quiet pride what a great season this has been for this University of Connecticut women's basketball team.

How much they have taught us, not just in the fact that they had an undefeated season, which makes them only the second women's team in NCAA history to finish a championship season undefeated; not just that they won the championship yesterday against a very formidable Tennessee team, but for all they have done for our State of Connecticut to make us proud, to make us feel a little bigger than we normally feel in a relatively small State, not only helping us through the winter and raising our sights as we come out of the recession, but reminding us what sports is all about.

Women's basketball at the collegiate level has reached the big time. It has not, obviously, at the professional level, and in some ways because of that inequity, this sport remains as pure as sport was meant to be. And in the midst of strikes and contract disputes in other sports, in the midst of extraordinary competition for enormous salaries and promotional contracts, it is great to see a sport, and in this case, to focus in on this team of UConn Huskies, that plays the game for the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5025

love of the sport and for the devotion that they have to one another and to their coach.

These are true scholar-athletes. The All American Player of the Year, Rebecca Lobo, has an extraordinary average, was considered for a Rhodes scholarship, and can make a contribution in whatever she has done.

This team taught us something else about teamwork. Some of the other sports which we watch are focused on not only the extraordinary accomplishment of the performers, but the enormous egos of the athletes. Rebecca Lobo was criticized a while ago gently by her coach for being too selfless, for not shooting the ball enough, for being too focused on team play. And she still managed, in spite of all that, to be there yesterday at the critical moments to help turn the game around, and in the last 2 minutes, to take this team ahead.

So, UConn Huskies women, your coach Geno Auremma, we thank you from the bottom of our hearts for bringing the championship back to Connecticut. And we thank you, too, for reminding us what American sports was meant to be, has traditionally been, and what you have made it again in our time.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. I understand that we are in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. And the time is limited to how many minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent to be able to proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SELF-EMPLOYED HEALTH INSURANCE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments to explain at least my understanding of where we are in terms of Senate procedure.

I think the majority leader and the minority leader will come to the floor shortly and propound a consent request which I will certainly support. I urge my colleagues to also support it so that we will have a final resolution and disposition of the conference report. We will do that sometime this afternoon in a way that accommodates the greatest number of Members. And I have every intention of supporting the

conference report. I had that intention last week, and I have that intention today. I hope the Members do as well. It is a very important measure which means a great deal to the self-employed and small businesses across the country, as it does provide protection for those who are purchasing health insurance. It makes sense to give the self-employed some help and assistance in recognition of the pressures they are under in terms of health care.

As I had mentioned over the course of last week, it was never my intention not to proceed to that particular program. Rather, I wanted to draw the attention of the Senate to changes which took place in the legislation from the time that it passed the Senate, when it included a provision to close what has grown into a sizable tax loophole. That loophole would permit some of the wealthiest individuals in this country, by renouncing their citizenship, to escape the financial responsibilities for accumulation of significant amounts of wealth in this country.

The fact remains there were provisions already in existence in the Tax Code to try and capture that accumulation of wealth, but it had not been effective. Through the work of the Senator from New Jersey, Senator BRADLEY, an amendment was offered to address that very sizable loophole in which individuals could become Benedict Arnolds by renouncing their American citizenship and walking off with hundreds of millions of dollars in accumulated wealth, and then taking up residency in Belize or the Cayman Islands or other places around the world, and avoid their participation in ensuring that this country is going to remain free.

This is an extremely offensive loophole. I think all of us commended the Senate Finance Committee in eliminating the loophole. It was only in the few hours prior to the time that we were requested to take action on the conference report that it was brought to our attention that the loophole which was closed by the Senate had effectively been reopened by our House colleagues, and that the \$3.6 billion that would have been recaptured over 10 years was effectively lost. Not only myself but my other colleagues were so troubled by that action that we wanted to at least have an opportunity to present to the Senate, at the time when we were going to accept the conference report, a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that would indicate not just other Members' desire to close that loophole, but also reflect the totality of our support for that action.

As I said last week, I do not doubt the sincerity of the members of the Finance Committee when they said that they would address that issue down the road. But we have seen at other times that what really speaks the strongest is when you have a unanimous vote. I believe that this would win a unanimous vote and certainly should win a unanimous vote of the Members—Re-

publicans and Democrats alike. It is absolutely outrageous and unacceptable to permit the plundering of the Treasury by selfish individuals who refuse to be part of our American system.

Mr. President, I was reminded last week that, under the Senate rules, the sense-of-the-Senate resolution would not be appropriate on a conference report because of Senate rules. I think if there ever was a legitimate reason for an exception to overturn a ruling of the Chair this would be one so that the Senate could go on record as to what the real sentiment of the Members would be on this particular issue.

Nevertheless, I had tried to see if we could not work out at least an opportunity to vote on the sense-of-the-Senate resolution as a separate matter, hopefully prior to the time that we pass the conference report or at a time related to the conference report, because it makes a great deal of common sense.

The conference report is the instrument by which this matter was considered. It would be appropriate to consider a sense-of-the-Senate resolution at the time of its acceptance or shortly thereafter.

The majority leader has laid down the cloture motion, which, as I mentioned, I expect will be vitiated with the understanding that we will vote later in the afternoon. I certainly will support that. We will have an opportunity prior to the time of the vote to review where we are in terms of the conference report and also where we are in the Senate debate on priorities. Because that is really the issue—the priorities being reflected in the rescission proposal of the Appropriations Committee.

During the course of the presentation by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, they have outlined the areas where there are going to be rescissions.

In response to that outline, the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, in consultation with a number of Members on our side, had proposed an amendment to cancel rescissions totaling \$1.3 billion in the areas which are reflected in the chart here and which we have spoken of last week—the restoration of the AmeriCorps, drug free schools, title I education programs, Goals 2000, Head Start, the WIC program, school-to-work, child care, and also some housing and health training programs.

Mr. President, just to go back a step, many of us were under the impression that this matter was to be debated on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday or Thursday of last week. It reflected a principal opportunity for the Senate to reflect on how important these programs are for children and parents, and how we believe that the cuts in the rescission package were too deep. We wanted an opportunity to debate those cuts versus other cuts.

I respect the rights and the priorities that are being reflected in the second-degree amendment to the minority leader's amendment. We ought to have an opportunity for an exchange on that.

But, generally speaking in this institution, when the majority leader or the minority leader offers a proposal, we have an opportunity for a full and complete presentation of the amendment and the reasons for and against it.

We were in a situation where many of us thought the proposal would be considered last Thursday. Then, the Senator from New York, as is his right, sought and received recognition and offered his amendment on the Mexican loan issue. The Senate had a good debate on that particular measure. We did not conclude until late Thursday evening to at least reach a procedure by which that matter would be considered at a later time.

Then I was in the well on Thursday evening when the majority leader asked the minority leader, "Will we be able to consider your amendment and perhaps dispose of it as early as 1 o'clock on Friday so that people can meet their schedules?"

Although there was not a firm time agreement, I think those of us who were the sponsors thought we could take that matter up at 10 o'clock the next morning, then have a good chance to debate and vote on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, which would certainly have been appropriate.

So the amendment was offered, and there were short speeches on it. Then, within just a matter of minutes, an amendment in the second degree was offered. Many of us who had thought we would have time to have a debate on children and education were at least temporarily foreclosed from being able to make that presentation.

Then, at the noon hour, when some of us were still here, we were asked, at a moment's notice, for a consent agreement to not only proceed to the self-employed conference report, but also for immediate adoption of that.

That conference report, as I just referred to, was different from the measure that actually passed the Senate. The Senate measure would have provided \$3.6 billion in additional revenues, and that particular loophole in the bill would have benefited a dozen or so American citizens who renounce their citizenship for tax purposes. The cost would be \$3.6 billion over a period of 10 years, and we were asked to go ahead and agree to it.

There were questions, Mr. President, that should have been responded to. I appreciated the responses given by the Senator from Oregon on those issues raised in the conference.

Nevertheless, it seemed to me, if we were going to consider that measure in the conference report, we ought to have had at least been given an oppor-

tunity to resolve it with a very brief discussion before coming back to the Daschle amendment.

We were not permitted to do so, and so here we are this afternoon with the prospect of voting on the conference report and then the sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Mr. President, this issue becomes all the more significant when you look at the Daschle amendment, which invests \$1.34 billion on programs primarily focused on children and their education.

This measure regarding the expatriation tax break, however, is \$3.6 billion. It is interesting that our total return for reinvestment in children is only \$1.3 billion. It is a pretty interesting juxtaposition. Many of us are saying, look, if we can be so sensitive to the handful of multi-multimillionaires to give them a tax break of \$3.6 billion, then we ought to be able to at least say that the \$1.3 billion devoted to children for the Head Start Program and the WIC Nutrition Program is a higher priority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The time expires at 12 noon.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will just take 2 minutes. I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in terms of where we stand, I think this chart clearly juxtaposes what the issues are.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of all Americans believe that if we are going to give a tax benefit of \$3.6 billion, we ought to be able to at least try to do something about children, Head Start, the Women, Infants, and Children Nutrition Program, the School-to-Work Program, the Child Care Program, on the basis of importance and need. We will have an opportunity to address that later in the afternoon. I look forward to participating in that debate.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. What is the order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business lasts until the hour of 12 noon.

Mr. WELLSTONE. And at 12 noon, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture vote is to occur under the order.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Cloture vote is under the order at 12 noon. Mr. President, so we have how much more time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have approximately 4 minutes before 12 noon.

PRIORITIES

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, 4 minutes is not a lot of time, but let me just rise to support the powerful words of my colleague from Massachusetts.

We are talking about capital gains over \$600,000, that is the only real tax we are talking about. And we are talking about expatriates with incomes over \$5 million. We are just simply saying that if you are going to be making these gains over \$600,000 a year and you are going to renounce your citizenship as a tax dodge, then, in fact, you are going to have to pay above and beyond that \$600,000.

It just seems to me that that does meet some standard of fairness, and my colleague has pointed out the juxtaposition of these proposed cuts in drug-free schools, the Women, Infants, and Children Program, the Head Start Program, Child Care Program.

Mr. President, I have been on the floor over and over and over again with an amendment that speaks to the concerns and circumstances of children's lives. If we are going to be talking about cuts that dramatically affect the quality of life for children in America, quite often the most vulnerable citizens, and at the same time we are going to be talking about trying to let this kind of tax dodge go through, I just think that people in the country ought to understand what, in fact, reality is going on.

I do not think anybody intended to filibuster. None of us did. So it will be an overwhelming cloture vote. I do not think there is any question about that. But I do think that a little bit of sunshine is important, and I do think people in the country do need to understand the significance of what the Senator from Massachusetts has had to say.

I think the significance of it—and we will have time this week as we get into what I think is a real important debate for the country—has to do with priorities. What in the world are we doing enabling people to have this huge tax dodge that really runs up into the billions of dollars for people who make over \$5 million and, at the same time that we have this tax dodge going on, we are willing to be so generous with all too often the suffering of children in this country.

That seems a little bit like just a speech on the floor. I probably have less than 20 seconds now, but we are going to have a debate on all of these programs. When the language, I say to my colleague from Massachusetts, is programs, it seems abstract. But we are going to talk about what all this means in personal terms, in human terms to our communities, working families, and children. That will be the debate that we will get to. I look forward to that debate.

ROBERTA DOERING—NEW PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Roberta Doering of Agawam, MA, who today becomes president of the National School Boards Association [NSBA]. Roberta has served as a member of the Agawam School Committee for 25 years and has been active in both the State and national school board associations for many of those years. She was elected to the executive committee of the national organization in 1991 and now assumes the role of president.

Her unwavering commitment to the welfare of the Nation's youth is demonstrated in her work with the schools and in other areas of service as well. She served for over 20 years on the board of directors of the Metropolitan Springfield YMCA and was the first woman president of that organization. She has also served on the board of trustees of the Springfield Library and Museum Association, and on the board of trustees of the Baystate Medical Center.

Roberta Doering deserves great credit for her service to education. Like so many dedicated citizens who serve on thousands of local school committees and boards across the country, she entered the arena because of her interest in children. She recognized the participation by citizens at the local level is vital if we are to assure quality educational programs for children and youth.

As she became knowledgeable about the Agawam system, she saw the need to do more. She explored what other communities were doing in the State, and what lessons from their experience could be applied to improve the schools in her own community. As a natural extension of her ability and interests, she became active in national education issues. Her path to the presidency reflects what so many of us in Congress understand. An active partnership among local, State, and national goals is vital to achieve educational excellence.

Roberta is clearly making a difference, and I commend her for her commitment as she begins her service as president of the National School Boards Association. I share the pride of the people of Agawam and Massachusetts that she will be serving all the Nation's children, and I wish her success in this important new undertaking.

TRIBUTE TO UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the University of Tennessee Lady Volunteers basketball team for yet another outstanding NCAA tournament. After an impressive record 34-2, the Lady Vols advanced through the NCAA tournament to face

the undefeated University of Connecticut Huskies in the championship game yesterday.

The Lady Vols were on the verge of their fourth NCAA title in the closing minutes of the final game. With only 4 minutes left, the Huskies rallied back to defeat Tennessee by 6 points—70-64.

Mr. President, I want to commend these young women, as well as their head coach Pat Summitt and assistants Mickie Demoss, Holly Warlick, and Carolyn Peck for their hard work and dedication this year. They have made the University of Tennessee, the city of Knoxville, and the entire State of Tennessee proud.

The seniors who played their last college basketball game yesterday should look back on a job well done and a season Tennesseans won't easily forget. And those team members who will be on the court next year can look forward to building upon the strong foundation they have helped establish this year.

Again, I applaud the University of Tennessee Lady Volunteers for an outstanding season, and I look forward to many exciting seasons to come.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MOTHER OF THEM ALL

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, a popular trend among the liberal elements of the news media today is their assertions that efforts to rid the current welfare system of waste and inefficiency are heartless and cruel. Aside from being untrue, such statements ignore the extraordinary things that are going on in America today. For example, the story of Mrs. Carol Porter, co-founder of Kid-Care, Inc., a nonprofit organization that feeds needy children in Houston, TX. I was reminded of Mrs. Porter and her family's efforts on behalf of Houston's hungry children when I read a March 20 People magazine article, headed "Mother of Them All."

Mr. President, I have met with the remarkable Carol Porter on several occasions, the first of which was in October 1993 when she visited Washington to receive an award for the very work detailed in the People magazine article. Senators and staff members would be impressed, as I am, if they could spend just a few brief minutes with this wonderful lady and her husband.

Why? Two reasons come to mind:

The first is her totally unselfish attitude which puts the needs of others before her own. It began when Carol Porter was driving through Houston during the Christmas season of 1989. By chance she happened upon a group of youngsters eating out of a fast-food dumpster. It was then that she and her husband decided to operate a feeding program from their three-bedroom home.

Today, Porter and the volunteers at Kid-Care deliver 500 free meals to Houston's poor neighborhoods. Plans are underway to move into a facility enabling them to produce 4,000 meals a day,

without 1 cent of support or subsidy from the U.S. Government.

My second thought: As the U.S. Senate prepares to debate various facets of the House-passed welfare-reform proposal, Senators should keep in mind Mrs. Porter's admonition when she was asked about Government assistance. Mrs. Porter said, "I'm against people saying, 'Let the Government do it.' I say it's time for Americans to feed Americans."

Mrs. Porter's message to all of us is both needed and refreshingly clear: The Government cannot do it all, nor can it afford to. But the needs of others can be met if each of us does our part.

Mr. President, I do hope my colleagues will have time to read the article describing an extraordinary lady doing an extraordinary work. I ask unanimous consent that the March 20, 1995, People magazine article, "Mother of Them All," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From People magazine, Mar. 20, 1995]

MOTHER OF THEM ALL: CAROL PORTER FEEDS POOR KIDS IN HOUSTON—WITHOUT A CENT FROM THE GOVERNMENT

The white van squeals to a stop in the loose gravel of a dilapidated mobile-home park in Houston. The driver blasts the horn five times, and children come running from every direction. One little boy in a blue sweatsuit races back from the van to his mother, excitedly waving a lunch bag over his head. He knows the sack contains a plain turkey sandwich, an apple, a granola bar and some juice. But he couldn't be happier with a bag of Halloween candy.

"How excited would you be if you hadn't eaten since we were here yesterday?" asks Carol Porter, 50, co-founder of Kid-Care, Inc., a nonprofit group that helps feed some of Houston's neediest children. "It's better than ice cream to these kids. It's hope."

Porter and Kid-Care's corps of up to 25 volunteers deliver 500 free meals each day to children in one of Houston's poorest neighborhoods. Every morsel is prepared by volunteers in Porter's cramped North Houston home, where extra stoves and refrigerators are shoe-horned into what used to be the family's living room and den. Remarkably, Kid-Care accepts no public funding. "I'm against people saying, 'Let the government do it,'" says Porter. "I say it's time for Americans to feed Americans."

Carol Porter, a registered nurse, and her husband, Hurt, 52, a former radio announcer—they have a son, Hurt III, 20, and a daughter, Jamillah, 10—might serve as a poster couple for the Contract with America. They are black Republicans who are dead set against welfare in its current form. "I get a lot of flak from black folks," says Carol Porter. "But I'm basing my belief structure on what I know. And I know we need welfare reform with compassion."

"I think we should do more to encourage self-reliance, and that's what the Porters are doing," says Texas Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson.

Compassion is something the Porters learned from their parents. Carol, in fact, credits her late mother, Lula Doe, with planting the idea for Kid-Care. It was Lula who, in 1984, persuaded a local supermarket not to discard its blemished produce but to let her distribute it to the poor.

The Kid-Care idea began to take shape at Christmas 1989, when Carol came on a group of children eating out of a McDonalds' dumpster. "I saw Third World conditions a stone's throw from where I live," she says. Two years later, Kid-Care was created as a non-profit organization.

These days, the Porter's three-bedroom bungalow is hemmed in by Kid-Care vehicles. Industrial-size cans of beans, tomatoes, corn and spaghetti sauce line shelves tacked up in the family room. Bags of disposable diapers, bulk rice and dozens of loaves of bread are stacked alongside. In the center of the room is a banquet table, where the sandwiches are prepared in a huge assembly line. In the next room, a magnet stuck to one of four refrigerators reads, "Carol's Kitchen." "Hah!" snorts Carol. "This hasn't been my kitchen in years."

Until late last year, Kid-Care provided not only brown-bag lunches but also hot meals. That was when the Houston health department forced the Porters to suspend cooking operations until certain code violations were remedied. That problem should be solved by May. When the Porters hope to move Kid-Care into its newly acquired 11,500-square-foot building equipped to produce 4,000 hot meals a day. That is, of course, if they can increase their funding. Carol Porter's tireless fund-raising has given Kid-Care high visibility among corporations—Quaker Oats and long-distance company Heartline Communications are sponsors—but most of the current annual budget of \$500,000 comes from individual donations. The couple supplements Hurt's \$2,000-a-month stipend from Kid-Care with a contract to oversee Houston-area daycare providers for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Hurt III earns \$1,000 a month managing Kid-Care's transportation.

Carol, whose dream is to seed Kid-Care groups across the country, draws no salary. "People ask me what's in it for me," she says. "And I tell them to go the route with me and see my kids' faces. That's what's in it for me."

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, for 3 years I have made daily reports to the Senate regarding the exact Federal debt as of the previous day.

We must pray that this year, Federal spending will begin to be reduced—it hasn't yet. Indeed, if we care about America's future, Congress must face up to its responsibility to balance the Federal budget.

As of the close of business Friday, March 31, the exact Federal debt stood at \$4,864,115,841,256.92, meaning that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,464.61 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

It's important to note, Mr. President, that the United States had an opportunity to begin controlling the Federal debt by implementing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Unfortunately, the Senate did not seize their first opportunity to control this debt—but rest assured they will have another chance during the 104th Congress.

If the Senate does not concentrate on getting a handle on this enormous debt, their constituents are not likely to overlook it 2 years hence.

SELF-EMPLOYED HEALTH INSURANCE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of the conference accompanying H.R. 831

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12 noon having arrived, under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 831, Self-Employed Health Insurance Act:

Robert Dole, Bob Packwood, John Ashcroft, Orrin Hatch, Richard Lugar, Lauch Faircloth, Larry Pressler, Thad Cochran, Trent Lott, Pete Domenici, Rick Santorum, Larry Craig, Alfonse D'Amato, Hank Brown, James Inhofe, and Slade Gorton.

CALL OF THE ROLL VITIATED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Pursuant to rule XXII, the chair now directs the clerk to call the roll to ascertain the quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and it has been cleared by the Democratic leader—I ask unanimous consent that the live quorum under rule XXII be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the conference report accompanying H.R. 831, the Self-Employed Health Insurance Act, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DOLE. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "yea."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] would each vote "aye."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Abraham	Dorgan	McCain
Akaka	Exon	McConnell
Ashcroft	Faircloth	Mikulski
Baucus	Feingold	Moseley-Braun
Bennett	Feinstein	Moynihan
Biden	Ford	Murkowski
Bingaman	Frisk	Murray
Bond	Glenn	Packwood
Boxer	Gorton	Pell
Bradley	Grams	Pressler
Breaux	Grassley	Pryor
Brown	Gregg	Reid
Bryan	Harkin	Robb
Bumpers	Hatch	Rockefeller
Burns	Helms	Santorum
Byrd	Hollings	Sarbanes
Chafee	Inouye	Shelby
Coats	Jeffords	Simon
Cohen	Johnston	Simpson
Conrad	Kempthorne	Snowe
Coverdell	Kennedy	Specter
Craig	Kerrey	Stevens
D'Amato	Kerry	Thomas
Daschle	Kohl	Thompson
DeWine	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Dodd	Lieberman	Warner
Dole	Lugar	Wellstone
Domenici	Mack	

NOT VOTING—17

Campbell	Hutchison	Lott
Cochran	Inhofe	Nickles
Graham	Kassebaum	Nunn
Gramm	Kyl	Roth
Hatfield	Leahy	Smith
Heflin	Levin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 83, the nays are zero. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. DODD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PERFECT SEASON FOR UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT WOMEN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am holding up in my hands the front page of today's Hartford Courant, which reads "Perfect." It shows a photograph of the University of Connecticut women's basketball team and the score of the game, 70 to 64, over Tennessee.

Mr. President, you will certainly appreciate the fact that there is a certain

amount of local pride in the Nutmeg State this morning. The women's basketball team completed their tremendous season, 35 and 0. It is the best record ever compiled by a men's or women's basketball team, culminating in the NCAA title against Tennessee. The other team that went undefeated, 34 and 0, was the University of Texas in 1986.

What makes this team unique is the intellectual as well as the athletic ability of its players. The star player—I am hesitant to use the word—Rebecca Lobo, was chosen first team All American and first team Academic All American the last 2 years. She is a candidate for a Rhodes scholarship and winner of every Player of the Year Award this season. She has compiled a 4.0 grade point average during her last 2 years at the University of Connecticut and is the No. 1 women's basketball player in the United States.

She is joined on that remarkable team that won the championship game yesterday by Jennifer Rizzotti, Kara Wolters, Jamelle Elliott, Pam Webber, Nakisha Sales and many other talented players. Rebecca Lobo, Jennifer Rizzotti, Kara Wolters, and Jamelle Elliott were named to the all-tournament team. It is the first time that four players from one team were named to that honor.

Mr. President, today is a day of great pride in the State of Connecticut because of the accomplishment of this great team.

I wish to pay a special tribute to Geno Auriemma, the head coach of the team, who did a remarkable job this season, and to the fans. You could not get a seat in Gampel Pavilion this year; they sold out every single game.

Mr. President, I am going to include in the RECORD as well, a couple of sidebar stories that go to the heart of a few other issues. The stories are about young women in the State of Connecticut, 9-, 10-, 12-year-olds, who were watching this team during the last year and who have become tremendous fans. It goes to the issue of title IX and the success of a program, a women's program, a basketball program. Just a few years ago you probably would have found only a handful of people watching a women's basketball game, not only at the University of Connecticut but all around the country. And today, as I mentioned a moment ago, there are sell-out audiences, sell-out crowds. This is a great tribute to title IX and those who fought so very hard for that program.

We are very proud in Connecticut today. We have always had to export our team allegiances to either the Boston Red Sox, the New York Knicks, the Mets, or others. Lately, we have had a hockey team which has not done terribly well, but now there is deep pride over this remarkable team that did a fantastic job in their quest for a national championship.

I join my colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, who I know spoke already,

in congratulating all the people involved in this great season.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I would like to offer my congratulations as well to the women's team at the University of Connecticut, and I would like to call attention to a quote by its star player, Rebecca Lobo, in this morning's Washington Post. When she was asked what the victory meant to her, she said:

This is just a picture-perfect way for someone to end their career. We are undefeated, we won a national championship and I did it with people I love.

Mr. President, that openness is remarkable and should be applauded, and it correctly captures the feeling among members of a 35 and 0 team that wins a championship, and that is true both of a men's team that would win a championship and a women's team that wins a championship. My hope is that someday when a men's team wins a championship, the star player can say those exact words and feel as comfortable saying them as Rebecca Lobo did yesterday.

I congratulate Connecticut for this tremendous accomplishment and Rebecca Lobo for her courage and leadership in difficult times in her own family situation, because of her mother having breast cancer, and also because of her determination that was shown every day that she went out onto the court with her teammates.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New Jersey for those comments. She is a remarkable young woman on a remarkable team, and the joy of watching them win was only exceeded by their joy in winning. There are no NBA careers in front of them. There are no six-figure, seven-figure salaries awaiting these young women—just the joy of playing the game, the joy of victory and the joy of doing it together. It needs to be heralded. It needs to be highlighted. We need to get back to that very spirit of amateur sports.

I congratulate as well the team from Tennessee. Tennessee has won several national championships in the women's basketball division. They lost to Connecticut yesterday, but they are a great team and a great champion as well. I just know we are going to see more and more of them. I think it is a wonderful thing in America to be able to watch young women get the kind of attention they did.

By the way, the President called the coach yesterday. It is the first time a President has ever called an NCAA women's champion after the title game. I congratulate and thank President Clinton for making that call to the Connecticut women's basketball team.

They went down to the White House last year and could not get in. There was a long line. They were here in the office and met with Senator LIEBERMAN

and me, but they had to go back to their schedule and practice, so they could not get in to the White House. Yesterday, the coach asked the President if this time they might be able to come through the front door of the White House. The President extended an invitation to them to visit, and it is going to be a pleasure to go there with them and have them walk in the front door of the White House as the national champions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that I share his pride in those young women. And certainly, as a woman who does not quite make 5 feet tall, I am particularly awed by these women and their skill. We still have UCLA, as you know, Mr. President, going toward a championship, we hope. But I really have to say to the Senator, it made me feel so good to watch these young women.

I do hope someday they have more of a future. If they can sink the ball in the basket with the best of them, they ought to have a chance. That is a subject for another day and another time.

SELF-EMPLOYED HEALTH INSURANCE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to now take the floor to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for what he has done by bringing forward such an important issue really, not only to the Senate but to the people of the United States of America.

We are going to see on Friday, I say to my friend, a big celebration on the steps of the Capitol. Those Republicans who signed the Contract With America are going to be celebrating and saying how great it is that they passed a number of those provisions.

Well, I think what the Senator from Massachusetts is pointing out is that there are more people than just those Republicans who are going to be celebrating; some of those people are going to be the millionaires and the billionaires who got away with it again, who again got away with what I call tax murder. I actually call them tax traitors, because what they do is they make a lot of money in this country, millions and hundreds of millions, sometimes billions, and then they renounce their citizenship to escape any kind of State taxes. I think that is unpatriotic. I think it is in many ways acting like a traitor to this Nation.

This Senate, on a very clear vote, said let us end that kind of tax loophole. The Senator from Massachusetts was completely struck, as was I and others in this Chamber, when the tax

bill came back from the other Chamber, from the Republicans in the House who are so proud of their contract. And guess what? That tax loophole was not closed.

So on Friday, when the Republicans are celebrating their contract, there will be a celebration in a lot of places across this great land, where people will be saying, "Oh, thank goodness, I still have that kind of a loophole."

All the Senator from Massachusetts was asking us to do on Friday was to go on record, because it is too late to change that conference report. We do not want to hold it up. It does some other very important things, and we care about the small businesses and the farmers who are concerned about their tax deductibility for their health care, which is in that bill.

All the Senator from Massachusetts was asking was for a simple sense-of-the-Senate resolution so the Senate could go on record and say we are not turning our back on fixing this problem. We stand for average people in this Senate Chamber. And we are going to fix this problem and we are going to stop this tax loophole for the millionaires and billionaires who would renounce their citizenship in America to get away with having to pay their fair share of the taxes.

And guess what happened? The Republican leadership said, "No way. We are not going to have that vote."

Well, I hope some agreement can be reached—and I tell my friend that I stand with him—so that at some point in the near future we will have that vote so that people in this country will understand that the U.S. Senate is not changing its mind on fixing this loophole.

I also want to thank the Senator from Massachusetts and the Democratic leader, TOM DASCHLE, for bringing forward an amendment that I think is a very important amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill that is before this Senate.

The chart that the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, has put together shows what would be restored by our Democratic leader's amendment.

If ever you wanted to know the difference between Democrats and Republicans, here is your chance. Mean-spirited, unnecessary cuts put forward in an appropriations bill, a rescissions bill; unnecessary.

For AmeriCorps, the Daschle amendment will restore \$210 million. I ask my friend from Massachusetts, is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

(Mr. JEFFORDS assumed the chair.)

Mrs. BOXER. I wish to engage my friend in a colloquy.

I had a wonderful experience visiting an AmeriCorps Program in Los Angeles. I want to tell my friend that the Americorps volunteer—and by the way, our Republican friends say: They are not volunteers. They get a stipend.

They get money for their education. They are not volunteers.

Well, I say to my friend, could these people do this work without a stipend? Could they live? Could they give of themselves and back to community if they did not have the stipend? Did not the people in the Peace Corps, I say to my friend, have a way to live while they gave their service?

Mr. KENNEDY. If I could answer my friend, the Senator from California. She is putting her finger on a very important point, which is that voluntarism should not be just a luxury for the wealthiest individuals. There are many young people with limited resources that want to have an opportunity to give something back to their communities. We see that time after time.

What we are basically saying to those young Americans is: if you are prepared to give something back to your community, you will also have a stipend, which is effectively a minimum wage, to be able to live. You will also be able to get the equivalent of a year's down payment on your tuition at a State university to continue your education.

I like to think that part of our Nation's value system is to try and encourage young people to be involved in a selfless way, to give something back to their community and, second, to encourage people to move ahead in terms of their education.

Finally, let me say to my friend, the Senator from California, that we effectively had an agreement here in the United States Senate when we passed the national service program. We are going to have \$300 million in the first year, \$500 million in the second, and \$700 million in the third. We had very strong bipartisan support for that commitment. I think there was only a handful of Senators that voted against it. Now we have established a service program where young people have been recruited on the basis of an agreement and understanding that was reflected in the bipartisan effort.

The AmeriCorps Program, however, was targeted for a 75-percent reduction, more than any other single program. And I do not think that it is a coincidence that it happened to be a top priority of President Clinton's—one that he spoke about during the course of his campaign. He stated that it was one of his greatest initiatives and he spent a great deal of his own personal time and involvement to see that it became a reality. I can just say, from a personal point of view, each time he comes to Boston, he meets with these young Americorps volunteers and continues to inspire them, as he does others who are involved in voluntary programs.

These cuts are effectively taking the rug right out from underneath these volunteers. All we are saying to our colleagues is not to go back on your word to these young people. And that is what this amendment is all about.

Maybe next year, we are going to have to fight to try and get what resources are available for that program.

But are we now saying to the young people in the AmeriCorps Program who are committed to making a contribution to their communities that the rug is pulled out from underneath them?

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend, because I have to say that I did notice broad support for this when it came up. The Senator from Massachusetts certainly worked on it, as chairman of the committee at that time. Very few spoke out against it.

It is hard for me to believe, as the Senator has pointed out, that this is not some kind of political attack. Because President Clinton said during his campaign, just as the Peace Corps, which sent our young people abroad, was so effective in helping people abroad, let us have that in America where we have problems in our schools, where we have problems in our nursing homes, where these young people can give something back and have a sense of community and of giving back.

And so the Daschle amendment, as my friend points out, will restore this funding.

I will tell you one story about my visit to a school in Los Angeles, where I meet with an AmeriCorps volunteer and some of the students in a pretty tough school. This school is made up of kids who were basically first-generation Americans. Their parents work in the garment district in Los Angeles in very, very tough conditions, minimum wage conditions.

And, of course, that is another issue, I say to Senator KENNEDY, that he has lead the fight on. We have opposition from the Republicans, unanimously. God forbid we should raise the minimum wage, which is at a 40-year low in terms of purchasing power.

And they say, "Oh, it helps get teenagers into the job market." Most of the people on minimum wage, as the Senator knows, are adults. They use that money to live on and try to provide for their families. That is another issue. But it all fits into the same pattern, I say to my friend.

Very quickly, they did away with closing a tax loophole that helps the billionaires; just dropped it right out of the conference. But with a lot of forethought and talk about the deficit, and a lot of time to concentrate, they cut money for young people, for their hopes, for their dreams, for their future.

And they say they care about the deficit. Not one of them voted for the \$500 billion deficit reduction that every Democrat took a risk and went down to that well and voted for. And we have had the biggest deficit reduction in our history. We have had 3 years of declining deficits, and the smallest work force since John Kennedy with a Democratic Congress.

We did not take a meat ax to these programs, I say to my friend. We took a scalpel.

We closed loopholes. We said to the wealthiest in this country—those over \$200,000—you may have to pay a little more. Over on the House side with their contract, they want to give a contract to those who earn \$200,000 a year.

When I went to the school, I say to my friend, I met a little child who was shot in a drive-by shooting, and an AmeriCorps volunteer went to see him in the hospital every single day and turned that child's life around. This is a living, breathing human being, first-generation American who now believes in this country.

I say to my friend, they say that sometimes children ask the best questions. Do you know what some of those kids talked to me about, the ones who were afraid of losing their school lunch program? Here is what they said:

"Who gets the money if you cut us out of the program?"

I could not believe they asked that question.

"Who gets the money, Senator, if I do not get my lunch?"

And I have to tell them, "The Republicans want to give a tax break to the wealthiest people in this land, and I won't let them do that and take food out of your mouth."

I do not care if I am saying something popular or unpopular, but I am going to stand on this floor with my friend until hell freezes over before that happens in this U.S. Senate.

I see that my friend has put another chart up here. I ask him to explain it, if he would do that.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will be glad to. I had not anticipated we would be debating this issue at this time, but I think perhaps it is appropriate.

This is a chart showing that the top 12 percent of taxpayers get more than half of the tax benefits in the Republican plan. More than 50 percent of the tax benefits would go to those individuals who earn over \$100,000.

I think this makes the point that the Senator has been talking about. What we are faced with in these rescissions is the cutbacks in the various programs which have been identified by the Senator from California—in AmeriCorps and drug-free schools. We had a very important and eloquent debate on the problems of violence in our schools and how we are going to deal with it.

Other programs targeted for cutbacks include:

The chapter 1 program, which was completely revamped in the last Congress, again, with strong bipartisan support. If the Senate rescissions stand, 70,000 children across the country will not be participating in these programs which try to assist young people that come from economically disadvantaged communities.

Goals 2000—this cut will result in 1,300 school districts not participating in education reform programs.

The Head Start programs, which have been tried, tested, and reevaluated.

The WIC nutrition program, school-to-work, child care, and the list goes on and on.

These cuts, as the Senator has talked about, are going to be used for the House Republican tax cut, which will go to the top 51 percent of the taxpayers.

That is fundamentally wrong, as the Senator from California understands. I do not believe that that is what the Americans are really for.

You would hardly understand that this is what is being cut here. You will hear general comments about how we have to cut back on programs and discretionary spending in order to deal with the deficit. The fact is, the programs which are being cut back are to be used for the tax cut to the wealthiest individuals. I just do not think that is right. This is the argument that the Senator from California is making, and I welcome the chance to join with her.

Mrs. BOXER. I say to the Senator in closing my comments that I did not come here to take from the kids and give to the rich. And I did not come here to throw the women and children over first. And that is exactly what the Republicans are doing in this Congress.

Cut the WIC Program, the Women, Infants, and Children Program that gives nourishment to pregnant women who may not be able to afford it? Every dollar we put in that program saves from \$3 to \$10. Why? Because we give them nourishment—cheese, milk, and things they need.

I have a pregnant daughter right now—the light of my life. I am going to have my first grandchild. Every day I call her: "Did you take your vitamin pill? Are you eating right?"

I say to my friends, we ought to care about the pregnant women in this country who may not have a mom or a dad to call them up in the morning, who may not even have the education to know that it is important. And, listen, it pays off. It pays off because we have healthier children and less costs, less costs to put these babies in incubators, not to mention the humanity involved here.

Where is our decency here? I do not know. But what I know is that I am proud to be associated with the Senator from Massachusetts. I think what he is pointing out is a tie-in between these tax breaks for the wealthiest people among us and the taking from the children. I think it is reprehensible, and I will join that fight. The fight has just begun, I say to my friends.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Cloture has been invoked; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. So now each Member is entitled to speak up to an hour; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I do not intend to use all the time, and I have every expectation we will have a final vote on this sometime in the early or midafternoon, a time to be set

by the majority and minority leaders. I thought that process would be worked out. I did want to be able to address the Senate for just a few moments at this time on the issue of the tax loophole.

The current tax laws contained an unjustified tax loophole that exists for billionaires who renounce their American citizenship in order to avoid taxes on the wealth that they have accumulated as Americans. I commend the Finance Committee for closing the loophole in its action on the 25-percent health care deduction for small business. The Finance committee took the action despite the fact that the revenue gained was not needed to pay for the health care deductions for small business owners in the bill.

In fact, the committee requested that the revenues be used for deficit reduction, exactly the type of action necessary if we are serious about achieving a balanced budget.

Closing this loophole would raise \$1.4 billion over the next 5 years, \$3.6 billion over the next 10 years, according to the Senate Finance Committee report.

In too many cases, we close tax loopholes only when we need to raise revenues for specific spending measures, whether they involve direct expenditures or tax expenditures. In this case, the committee closed this flagrant loophole as soon as it was brought to the committees's attention, and rightly so. All of us thought the issue was settled. Now it comes back to us from the Senate-House conference and the loophole has been reopened. And the outrageous tax break for two dozen or so of the most wealthy individuals in the country will remain wide open. This is all happening, of course, at the same time that we are cutting Federal funds for basic investment and for the future of children and working families. Funds for education, housing, and vital social services are all being drastically cut at the very time our Republican colleagues are deciding that this tax break is not flagrant enough to be terminated immediately.

All citizens of the United States have a basic right to leave the country and live elsewhere and to relinquish their citizenship. That is not what this provision is about. Every citizen has the right to repatriate. We would not want the Tax Code to be used to outlaw that action.

At the same time, though, we do not want the Tax Code to be an enticement to citizens to renounce their citizenship. The law would not prevent individuals from shifting their assets and citizenship to a foreign country; rather it would make sure that those who have amassed great wealth through the U.S. economic system pay their fair share of taxes.

Last year, approximately 850 individuals renounced their citizenship, but

only a handful of those would have been affected by this legislation. The tax loophole we are trying to close is not one that applies to all those who renounce their citizenship. As a result, it is wrong to call this an exit tax. It only applies to those with a minimum of \$600,000 in unrealized capital gains, which would necessitate a minimum of \$5 million of net worth. All those below that level of liability could renounce their citizenship without the IRS ever questioning their motives. But the fact of the matter is that many of these wealthy individuals are leaving the country for only one reason—to avoid taxes that they rightfully owe the Government.

In some cases, the individuals involved have the best of both worlds. They renounce their citizenship, avoid millions of dollars of tax liability, but still spend up to 6 months a year in the United States. In many cases, their families stay in the United States, taking full advantage of the U.S. standard of living and quality of life.

In other cases, wealthy individuals are gaining from the system to an even greater degree. They are renouncing their citizenship to avoid European taxes, also. Then they take up European citizenship but live part time in a Caribbean tax haven so they cannot be taxed by their new European home country.

Some have suggested that this provision would unlawfully restrict the fundamental right of voluntary expatriation and emigration. This is not the case. The State Department has stated that this provision does not conflict with the international human rights law concerning an individual's right to freely emigrate from his or her country of citizenship. It also recognizes that a state, in order to protect its interest, may impose economic controls on a departure as long as such controls do not result in a de facto denial of an individual's right to emigrate.

Requiring individuals to pay taxes on gains that accrue prior to expatriation does not constitute a de facto denial of an individual's right to leave a country.

These are comparable taxes to those which U.S. citizens or permanent residents would have to pay were they in the United States at the time they disposed of the assets or their debt. Under the current law, if the IRS suspects that an individual has renounced his or her citizenship in order to avoid taxes, it will attempt to tax the holdings for an additional 10 years. The IRS must establish that it is reasonable to believe that the individual gave up citizenship to avoid taxes. The burden of proof that the move was not for tax reasons falls on the former citizen.

Current law needs to be tightened because individuals are easily evading it. The law provides for that with the taxing of their income for an additional 10 years after expatriation. But they avoid the tax completely by postponing the realization of gains for the first decade after leaving the United States.

So the concept has been at least included in the tax law. As I understand from the experience, that law provides that 10 years after expatriation, that income has basically been hidden or shielded. And the Finance Committee addressed that issue and was to be able to recover what was necessary.

The Finance Committee report itself states:

The committee is concerned that present law—

So this is not a new law; it is a new way of dealing with the loopholes that exist.

The committee is concerned that under present law, which bases the application of the alternative method of taxation under section 877, proof of a tax avoidance purpose has proven difficult to administer. In addition, the committee is concerned that the alternative method can be avoided by postponing the realization of U.S. source income for 10 years. The committee believes that section 877 is largely ineffective to tax U.S. citizens who expatriate for the principal purpose to avoid the tax.

The proposed provision is similar to those in other countries, including Canada and Australia. The concept is also similar to laws in many States, where individuals who move to other States are taxed on compensation earned before the move though it may not be received until after the move.

The law would be limited in its scope. It would not apply to real estate or pensions, regardless of their value. We already tax gains on real estate of foreign citizens as a result of the sale of property. Under the Finance Committee reform, the State Department would notify the IRS when anybody relinquishes their U.S. citizenship. The State Department would provide appropriate information to assist the IRS in enforcing the provision.

As the report of the Senate Finance Committee stated on this provision, it is fair and equitable to tax expatriates on the appreciation of their assets when they relinquish their U.S. citizenship.

I regret that Congress is unable to act now to close this billionaires' tax loophole in the current tax bill. We know that our Republican colleagues are quick to call for deep cuts in programs that help working families, children, college students, senior citizens, and other deserving Americans. So it is ironic that our Republican colleagues show so much solicitude for the least-deserving Americans—those who want to renounce their citizenship in order to evade their fair share of taxes on the massive fortunes they have accumulated from the blessings of America. This tax loophole should be closed as soon as possible.

So, Mr. President, it was my purpose—and I am joined by a number of my colleagues. Although we were not technically able to do so in terms of the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves, at least we should be accorded an opportunity to vote on a resolution that would do just that—that is, remedy this situation.

I would expect that it would have overwhelming support. I would expect

that it would have unanimous support. I see on the floor my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Finance Committee. As I noted earlier today, he had given assurance, as did the Senator from New York, that this issue would be resolved in the conference, along with other members of the Finance Committee. Senator BRADLEY authored the provision in the Finance Committee, and he indicated that as well.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that Members ought to be able to express the sense of outrage that is felt by their constituents and be able to speak to this issue in support of a resolution that would urge that at the earliest possible time, there be action on this particular loophole. We do not doubt for a moment the sincere, dedicated, committed desire of the Members I mentioned and other members on the committee to do so.

To many of us who have been around long enough to know that when we are in those conferences and the House has a different view about this, that getting a unanimous, recorded vote by the membership, Republican and Democrat alike, with the strong assurances of the members of the Finance Committee, majority as well as minority, and all Members of the Senate on this, that this would be an issue that would be resolved and resolved in a timely fashion, and that this real injustice to all of the other American taxpayers—because when we have this kind of loophole, make no mistake about it, it is the hard-working men and women that are paying the taxes, playing by the rules, that make up the difference.

Every time you have this kind of a windfall and you create that deficit, what are we asked to do? We are asked to address the problems of the deficit. Here are where the cuts come. That is what we are being asked to do here—to cut the child care programs, the WIC Program, cut the Head Start Program. Why? For deficit reduction. And one of the good reasons we have it is because we have a loophole like the one I have just mentioned. It seems that the least we can do is to have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that reflects the combined body here of the Senate on the earliest possible time. I wish we could have worked out a process prior to the vote.

I understand that we will move to a vote. Of course we will have an opportunity to offer it on the underlying measure, in terms of the rescissions later on.

It would seem to me that it would be wise for the leadership to give a very clear indication about their support and make it easy to resolve this. Announce to the world that tomorrow at 10 o'clock, this afternoon at 5, we will vote on this. We will close this down.

But we cannot do that. We hear, "We are for it," but we will not be given an opportunity to vote on it. We are not going to say when we can get a vote on it. We have to conclude that if this is the case, why do we not just say at a time certain that we will get a resolution on this matter such that the majority leader and the minority leader and the members of the Finance Committee will all say, "This is an expression of the unanimous vote of the Senate." That is what we are desiring to do.

We are saying to the House of Representatives that the Senate of the United States—Democrats and Republicans—are all aligned together. We believe that action has to be taken, that this loophole has to be closed. We are prepared to go on record. We are prepared to set the time to do so.

I want just to finally indicate that I am very hopeful that we can do it. I will be eager to try and work with the leadership to try and establish that time. I will also be forced to remind our body, if we are not able to do it, as to what, really, is at issue.

It is the issue of fundamental fairness. An issue of which side are we on. Are we on the side of working families who are in the lifeline programs that reach the children of this country? In the child care programs, where we have long lines of parents trying to get quality child care? Or the school-to-work program for the 70 percent of the individuals who do not go on to 4-year college and want to be able to find employment? This program, which has strong bipartisan support, reflects a combination of business and educators and parents trying to get people into work.

Other programs include the WIC nutrition program, which was spoken to so eloquently by our friend and colleague, the Senator from California. The Head Start Program, which was reviewed by a bipartisan commission, virtually had a unanimous vote when it passed out of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, and had strong support in the House.

Goals 2000 education reform, which incorporates many of the ideas and suggestions of the previous Secretaries of Education.

The Chapter I Program that focuses on the educationally disadvantaged.

The Safe and Drug Free Schools Program—we obviously know that as much as we do to reform our education system, if we do not have a safe school, none of this will matter.

Finally, regarding the AmeriCorps Program, we must not pull the rug out from underneath the young men and women who are beginning to reap its benefits and serve their communities.

This is really something that I think all Americans can understand.

I see other colleagues that want to speak here this afternoon. I would hope that we will all understand the impact of these cuts when we vote on this measure. I can give the assurance to

the membership we will get a vote on it, hopefully sooner than later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority manager is recognized.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I thank the Chair.

It was almost 25 years ago that I traveled around the country with my good friend, the senior Senator from Massachusetts. I was then on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. He was, I believe, chairman of the Health Subcommittee. We were doing health hearings around the country going to hospitals, holding hearings.

There is no question that his compassion for the poor is unrivaled in this body. Sometimes, however, that compassion is confused by the volume of his oratory and the velocity of his statistics.

Volume and velocity are not necessarily accuracy. He uses the word "cut, cut, cut." Only in this Government—not in any State government that I know—only in this Government do we use the word "cut" as follows: cut means we are going to spend less than we thought we were going to spend in the future, even though it is more than we are spending now. That is a cut.

This would be a cut, to an average layperson. I am making \$1,000 a month. I think I am worth \$1,200 a month. I go to the boss and say, I am worth \$1,200. And the boss says I don't have \$1,200. I will give you \$1,100. You do not tell your wife you got cut \$200; you got \$100 raise. It is not as much as you hoped but more than you are getting.

I defy you to ask any average normal citizen in this country to define "cut" the way we define it.

Having said that, we will take a look at the quantity of money we now spend. The Federal Government—and we hate to be cavalier about this but I will round it off—the Federal Government this year will spend about \$1.5 trillion—"t," trillion, \$1.5 trillion.

If we were to spend \$1.5 trillion a year for the next 7 years—and the reason I pick that is the year 2002 we are hoping to get to a balanced budget—we would spend about \$11 trillion. We are planning to spend under current law, if we do not change the current law at all, we do not add anything like long-term care to Medicare, we do not add anything more to AmeriCorps or Head Start, over the next 7 years instead of spending \$11 trillion, as we would spend if we spent the same amount every year, we would spend \$15 trillion. That is if we do not change the laws. And we would still have the perpetual deficits.

In order to balance the budget by the year 2002, instead of \$15 trillion spent over the next 7 years, we need to spend about \$14 trillion. I want to emphasize, again, we are spending roughly \$1.5 trillion now.

If we continue to spend it over 7 years, we would spend about \$11 trillion. To balance the budget, we can do it and spend \$14 trillion. That is not a cut from what we are now spending—Social Security is not going to go

down, Medicare is not going to go down, Medicaid will not go down, education will not go down, food for the poor will not go down. They are all going to go up, not down.

The reason that people use the word "cut" is because they have a vested interest in the program. Often, they are bureaucrats who administer it and aggrandizement and bigger is good for bureaucracy. The more you can bigger, the better.

So we have come with this concept only, really, in the last 20 years, of what a cut is: Spending less than we were otherwise going to spend but more than we are spending now.

Unfortunately, the press has picked it up. They say Republicans plan to cut—whatever it is. So let me give an example. Let us take some of the programs that my good friend from Massachusetts has. Let us take Head Start and let us say we were going to spend \$500—\$100 a year on it over the next, let us say, 5 years: \$500; and let us say we were going to spend \$100 a year on school lunches for the next 5 years: another \$500; and \$100 on child care per year. So over 5 years, you have \$500 we would spend on Head Start, \$500 on school lunches, and \$500 on child care. That is \$1,500 we would spend over the next 5 years.

Let us say, however, that the current law—no change in the current law, we do not have to vote for anything—would say that on these programs we will spend \$200 a year. So over 5 years, instead of spending \$500, we would spend \$1,000 on each program. So on the three programs, instead of spending \$1,500, we spend \$3,000.

Now let us say the Republicans come forth and say, "We think, over the next 5 years on those three programs, instead of \$1,500 that we are now spending if you were to flatten it out, we think we should spend \$2,500; not \$3,000, \$2,500." The argument would be made we have cut the programs \$500.

We have not cut the programs. We have increased the spending \$1,000. It just is not as much as advocates of each of those programs would like. And we, everyone in this body, knows we are faced with this.

In comes a group whose principal purpose is education. It can often be conservative Republicans, let us say it is the National Association of School Boards. Except in very big towns, my experience has been that school board members are often Republicans, somewhat conservative, and they want to balance the budget. But they are on the school board, so in they come and say, "Yes, I am for the balanced budget amendment, I am for balancing the budget, but education is a special problem and you must increase spending for education. If we have to balance the budget, you should take it from someplace else." They leave.

In the next week comes the National Association of Hospital Boards of Directors. These are almost invariably Republicans, also. They are the town's

elite, the town's 400. They are generous in their charity. They give money to the hospital. In they come, and they understand the fastest growing program we have is health and they want to balance the budget. But they say, "You have to understand that health is in a special category. If the budget must be balanced, take it out of education." They leave.

In comes the National Association of the Chiefs of Police, and to them the most critical problem facing this country is crime and the budgets for their police department. These people are normally reasonably conservative, also. Probably if they had to vote on a balanced budget amendment, they would vote four or five to one for a balanced budget. But fighting crime is unique and different and, "If there is not enough money for everything, we should take it out of education and health so that we have it for crime."

None of these people are malevolent. Each of these people sees the world through their eyes. Each of them sees it through the programs that they administer or are committed to—and are committed to out of perfect decency. Yet, if you do not see the world as they see it, if you say, "Listen, somehow instead of spending \$3,000—we are now spending on the average only \$1,500—"we have to cut it to \$2,500," which is really a \$1,000 increase, but in order to pare down the increase by \$500, we have to take a little bit off of the increase in education and a little bit off the increase in health and a little bit off the increase in crime prevention—each one of them is mad at you because you did not see the world as they saw it.

I want to emphasize, again, when we finally get the welfare reform bill on the floor, when we finally get the entire budget bill on the floor—if we ever get it on the floor—and if we have a budget that gets us to a balance in 7 years, spending will be up for health, up for education. It may be down in defense. It will be up for child care. It will be up for almost every social program we know.

Aha, but the opponents are going to say, we cannot guarantee that because you are going to block grant it. By block granting, we simply mean we are going to give to the States some of these programs, with some money, and tell them to administer it.

Let me take the example I have used, these three: Head Start, school lunch, and child care. As I say, we are now spending \$100 each year, \$300 a year on the three of them; over 5 years, that is \$1,500. But if we did not make any change in the law over those 5 years, we would spend \$3,000. So let us say we say to the States we will make you a deal. We think you are closer to the people than we are. We think you know your problems better than we do. The problems of Oregon may not be the problems of New York. Certainly, the problems of Newport, OR, are not the problems of New York City. We are going to give to the States for these

three programs \$2,500 over 5 years, and say to the States, "You spend it as you want on these three programs: Head Start, school lunch, and child care."

But we do not say in each case how much they have to spend on each of those programs. They just have to spend the aggregate \$2,500 on those three programs. The States that are stable, with relatively lower divorce rates, with only one person in the household working, may not have the same child care problems that an urban area with illegitimate birth rates of 50 or 60 or 70 percent and no man around in the household, they may have a different problem about child care. It may not be as critical as it is when you are trying to get a woman off welfare, get her a job, and she has a child and the child is 1 or 2 years of age, and she is 19 and not quite out of high school—dropped out. She needs child care.

Maybe that State says, "We are going to have to spend more on child care than even what the Federal Government might have planned to have spent on that particular program. But we will spend a little bit less on Head Start or a little bit less—not less than we are spending, less than was planned to be spent."

So the argument will be made, if you give these programs to the States, there is no guarantee that they will have the compassion and the knowledge and the interest to take care of Head Start and school lunch and child care the way a compassionate Federal Government would. Not only that we understand the problems better, the argument goes, so we have to have programs that have a myriad of Federal regulations that go with them—not only do we understand them better, we are more compassionate. State legislators do not care about children, they do not care about nutrition, they do not care about Head Start. Governors are callous, backward people who have no concern that their children are well educated and well fed.

That is just baloney. We know it. For us to say at the Federal level that the Governors and the State legislatures do not care about these problems is outrageous. They care as much as we do, and they are closer to the problem than we are.

So let us get over this argument about cut, cut, cut. Are there going to be reductions in spending from what we would otherwise spend if we are going to balance the budget? Yes.

Will those be reductions from what we are now spending? No. Will they be somewhat less than the most wild-eyed, zealous partisan of these particular programs that they would like spent on their programs? Perhaps. We are going to have to ask everybody in this country to share in the reduction of the increase—not a cut—a reduction of the increase. This battle we are going to have at another time.

I mention this only because my good friend from Massachusetts has talked about this expatriate tax provision in

the bill that is currently before us which would allow the self-employed in this country to take a 25-percent deduction for health insurance which they purchase, and 30 percent starting in this year, and has said we have cut out the tax on the wealthy and we favor the wealthy at the expense of the poor at the very same time that we are cutting Head Start, and AmeriCorps. I say again we are not cutting. He likes to use the term. But we are not cutting. At the same time we are reducing the increase, we are cutting the tax on the malevolent rich who flee their country to avoid taxation.

First, in this country, if you leave it for purposes of avoiding taxation, we can tax you for 10 years. My good friend from Massachusetts has said, yes. But for 10 years. You can leave this country and you have what we call unrealized capital gains. Perhaps the price of a stock goes up. The value goes up but you have not sold it, and you do not sell it for 10 years. That is an unusual situation. It is very unusual for somebody to leave and not touch their assets for a decade. But if they leave this country now to avoid taxation, we can tax them for 10 years.

I will tell you what happened with this expatriate tax provision. I am frank to admit it was mostly my error in moving too rapidly. The House bill did not have this provision in it at all. We were doing what we call the markup on this bill, and Senator BRADLEY offered the provision to tax the expatriates. We had relatively little discussion about it. We adopted it without even a rollcall vote; no hearings; did not really grasp the significance of what we might be doing. We have done this before in this body.

I remember John Williams, who was a Senator from Delaware, Senator ROTH's predecessor, who served here 24 years, and he and I overlapped by 2 years. I was elected in 1968 he retired in 1970. But he used a wonderful expression once in which he said, "We make more mistakes in haste than we lose opportunities in delay."

I will give you one mistake we made. This tax provision that we put in the Senate bill only applies to American citizens. We have any number of people who come to this country from Cuba, Italy, Poland, Germany, and they are legal immigrants. They work here. They pay their taxes here. They are good citizens. They participate in life while they are here. But at the end of 30 or 40 years of work, and they have been very successful and have made a fair amount of money, they choose to go back home. The tug of the home country is there for people. So they go. They never became an American citizen. They are here legally. There is no complaint about that. They paid their taxes; no complaint about that. This bill does not apply to them. They never became an American citizen.

But take the same person from Poland, or Germany, or Cuba who comes here, becomes an American citizen, is

naturalized, decides to go back to the home country, they are taxed. We did not know that. It just did not occur to us.

I will give you another example. This is at variance of many naturalized citizens; some who fled Cuba or were forced out of Cuba when Castro seized control; in many respects confiscated much of their property. You had engineers and doctors coming here in 1960, 1961, 1962 and went to work in the most menial of occupations here because they had been driven out of their home land and had not yet passed licensure exams here, and had no money here. And over 30 years they have become very successful. They are the leading citizens in the movement to free Cuba of its dictatorial control. They will one day be successful. Some of them have become citizens, some not. My hunch will be when Cuba is free many of them will want to return home. That does not mean they are bad Americans, although in some cases they have not taken out citizenship. But it means they want to go back to their country when it is freed.

Are we going to tax them? Are they leaving for tax reasons? Are they leaving for patriotic reasons? Our bill taxes them no matter what. How many occasions have we had where citizens all over this world have had to flee their country and go into exile for 5, 10, 15 years because of a repressive government at home and they could not return until that government became free? And then they go home. How are they to be taxed? We did not consider it.

I will give you another example. A wealthy father sets up a trust for his grandson. The grandson marries a foreigner, perhaps met the foreigner when the grandson was a student overseas or in the military overseas and takes out citizenship in that country. The grandfather is still alive. The trust is revocable. Is the grandson, when he leaves this country, taxed on what we would call the corpus, the amount of that trust, even though he has not gotten it and may not get it? We do not know. We did not consider that problem. Nobody raised that problem.

I will give you another example. A person works here all their life. They are very successful. The employer for whom they work has been putting aside money in their pension plan. Finally, the accumulated pension plan with the interest and everything on it is significant and the person is to get x amount of dollars a month from the time they retire. He retires at 60, and goes back home. It is an American citizen. I think the way this is drawn that corpus, that amount in the pension plan, is taxed immediately. I think. I am not sure. Then I think the payments are taxed also when you get your pension. Did we intend that or did we not intend that? I am not sure what we intended.

I say this only to attempt to ameliorate the argument that this was done

at the behest of or because of the rich in this country; this was adopted in haste and we did not grasp its full consequences.

In addition, it was not in the House bill and the House with a vote on the floor before we went to conference with them instructed their conferees not to accept this provision. So the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and I have jointly put out a release saying we want the Joint Tax Committee, which is the professional group that so well advises the House and the Senate, to study this problem, give us a report by June 1. We will have hearings on it. There will be legislation enacted. And the effective date of it will be February 6 of this year so people cannot now get under the deadline in an attempt to flee the country at the moment before the law is in effect.

So the problem will be taken care of. But it will be taken care of in a responsible way. I say again, in this case, in my judgment we did not act irresponsibly. We did not act malevolently. We just did not grasp the consequences of what we were doing.

So I hope that the debate and the discussion would not be one of rancor and class warfare, that we are excusing the rich, and in order to do that we must eliminate programs for the poor. That is not the debate over this issue. It is a debate over equal protection of the laws, and under the equal protection of the laws everyone in this country is to be treated equally—the poor, and the rich, and you do not suffer a particular penalty solely because you are rich. A penalty that may—I emphasize “may” because we do not know—be unwise, may be unfair, may in some cases violate international treaties that we have agreed to. We are not sure.

I hope we can adopt very soon the conference report that we are discussing so that roughly 3.2 million self-employed working Americans in this country will know whether or not they can take a 25-percent deduction for health insurance premiums that they buy for themselves. They are not employed. Their employer is not paying for this. They pay for it. The longer we delay, the tougher it is going to be for them to know whether or not they can make this tax deduction, which is now going to have to be filed in just 12 more days.

So I thank the Chair. I hope we can conclude this debate not in a tax on the poor or a tax on the rich or an argument that the provision is a tradeoff so we have to cut programs for the poor. It is not that. And when this whole debate on spending and welfare and block grants is over, I hope it will be very clear to America that no one is cutting programs for the poor. The question is are we willing to somewhat restrain the increases so that we might achieve a balanced budget, so that those very children we are talking about now do not face the possibility of bankruptcy of this Nation or the bankruptcy of the Social Security System

or the bankruptcy of Medicare—and that is only 6 or 7 years away—so that they do not have to face that and pay for it because we refused to have the courage or the wisdom or the foresight to attempt to modestly reduce the increase in spending sufficiently to give them a balanced budget.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The distinguished Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am pleased to speak on the Daschle amendment. Let me just comment briefly on the observations of my friend from the State of Oregon.

It is true that the volume of Senator KENNEDY's remarks does not necessarily mean that there is virtue to his remarks, but in this case I believe there is virtue in his remarks. And because my colleague from Oregon speaks in a calm, less passionate voice does not mean necessarily that there is virtue to everything he had to say, some of which I agree with, some of which I do not. That we should provide tax breaks for the self-employed in their health insurance we agree completely.

When my colleague from Oregon says that this particular tax break is designed so that we have equal protection for everyone, the poor and the rich alike, it is true that if you are either poor or you are a millionaire and you move to the Caribbean and you renounce your American citizenship, you can get this tax break. But there are not going to be very many poor people who are going to take advantage of that. This is designed for those who are more fortunate economically.

When my friend argues that all we have to do in the future to achieve a balanced budget is to restrain spending, he is correct. If you assume and we were to pass, we were to pick up one more vote for a balanced budget amendment, if we had no cuts in interest rates—and every projection, CBO, Data Resources, all of them say we will have reduction in interest rates—if we were to have no changes in Social Security, we could increase spending 1.7 percent a year between now and the year 2002 and achieve a balanced budget. So that argument by Senator PACKWOOD is absolutely correct.

I serve on the Budget Committee. I want us to use not what we call euphemistically the current services budget but where we are now. That is how a family does it, as Senator PACKWOOD says correctly.

But the Senator from Oregon is incorrect when he said these are not cuts. What he said, if he were making a speech on the 1996 budget, would be accurate. In the rescission, what we are saying to groups is we are giving you the money. Indian housing, we have told them we have appropriated X number of dollars—I do not know the amount—for desperately needed housing on Indian reservations, and now we are coming along saying we are taking

back \$100 million of the money that you received. And you look through this.

To AmeriCorps, Senator DASCHLE will restore \$210 million, overwhelmingly supported by the American public; 90 percent support the idea. The Los Angeles Times showed 60 percent of the people who call themselves conservative support the idea.

Republican Governors. Montana's Governor says:

While balancing the budget, fighting mandates, and streamlining government, I am committed to this community service program for Montana.

Michigan's Governor:

AmeriCorps captures the promise found in all its citizens, young and old, who see problems in their communities and work together to solve them.

Massachusetts' Governor:

Governors of both parties have shared my enthusiasm for national service.

Title 1 helps poorer people, the disadvantaged. The reality is we do not do a very good job in the field of education in disadvantaged communities. I am not saying all education in disadvantaged communities is terrible, but it needs a lift.

It is very interesting that Sweden, which does not have the income disparities we have in the United States, spends two to three times as much for education in the disadvantaged areas as in the more affluent areas. We do the opposite.

I was on a call-in program this morning with station WILL in Champaign, IL, and a faculty member of the University of Illinois got on the phone and he interpreted my remarks as being negative about American education. But he made this significant observation. He said some of the finest students we have come from the Chicago suburbs.

The Chicago suburbs. Not the city of Chicago, where the need is so great, where, frankly, we are not spending the money. If there is any question about the value of title I since it was enacted, the gap between black and white students has narrowed significantly. For 9-year-olds, the gap in achievement test scores has closed by 18 percent in math and 25 percent in reading.

This program works. And this is a program we are going to cut back on if we do not adopt the Daschle amendment. The dropout rate for 16- to 24-year-olds has declined significantly for all students, from 17 percent in 1967 to 11 percent in 1993. The decline in the dropout rate has been even more dramatic for African-American students, going from 28.6 percent in 1967 to 13.6 percent in 1993: even with the present appropriation that this rescission would cut back without the Daschle amendment, 13 percent of high-poverty schools will receive no funds at all. In the city of Chicago, the Chicago school district, you have to achieve 56 percent of poverty in your school before you receive any help. Clearly, a needed program.

Goals 2000. We hear a lot of talk around here how we are going to help the States. Goals 2000 says to the States you set your standards, you establish the program, and we will provide some assistance. We cut back on that.

Safe and drug-free schools. Cut back \$100 million out of \$472 million appropriated. We are going to solve the problem of crime not just by building more prisons but by drug treatment programs, drug prevention programs, education programs—very much needed.

Head Start. Every study shows Head Start pays off in this country. And just about every Head Start program has a waiting list of young people to get into the Head Start program.

I visited the Head Start program in Rock Island, IL, where, like every Head Start program, they have a waiting list. In Rock Island, IL, on Monday morning, one group of children come in; Tuesday morning, a second group comes in; Wednesday morning, a third group, and so forth.

I asked the woman in charge: What would it mean if you could have the same children in here not just 1 day a week but all week? She smiled and said, "You can't believe the difference it would make in their lives."

We save money by not funding Head Start so that all young people who need the help can get into it, but it is extremely shortsighted.

The WIC Program; every study shows it pays off tremendously. That is the health program for women, infants, and children.

School-to-work. I heard Gov. Tommy Thompson from Wisconsin—and, as the Presiding Officer knows, he is a good Republican Governor—I heard him praise what we did in school-to-work. We are spending a huge amount of our education dollar for those young people who go on and get a bachelors degree, but 75 percent of our students do not do that. School-to-work is designed for everyone, but particularly for those who are not going to go on to get that bachelor's degree. There was \$30 million cut out of that.

Year-round youth training, under the JTPA Program, cut \$100 million. With the kind of youth unemployment that we have, I do not think it makes sense.

Immigrant education. I hear a lot of speeches that we ought to make English the official language around here. I do not know what it would mean, incidentally. Would that mean you cannot get a translation if you are in court if you speak Chinese or Spanish or some other language?

But it is interesting that when we come up for immigrant education to have classes so that people can learn the English language—and that is really the way you make English the official language, let people learn the language, and we ought to do that—we are cutting \$8.8 million out of that.

I believe that the amendment by Senator DASCHLE is a sound amendment.

I agree with Senator PACKWOOD and I agree with our Presiding Officer that

we need a balanced budget amendment and that we ought to start from a zero base and not a current services budget. My hope is, and my belief is, that Senator DOMENICI is going to do that with the Budget Committee this year.

But, I think it is a mistake to cut back, particularly in this area of education.

I note on the floor the presence of the Senator from Vermont, who has been rightfully telling us for some time we ought to be spending a higher percentage of our budget on education.

It is very interesting, as interest has grown because of the deficit, we have spent less and less on education. In fiscal year 1949, believe it or not, 9 percent of the Federal budget went for education. Today, 2 percent of our budget goes for education. We will spend 11 times as much this year on the gross interest expenditure as we will spend on education.

Mr. President, I hope we will adopt the Daschle amendment. This should not be a partisan matter. I think it makes sense. I hope we will do the right thing for the future of our country and vote for it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Cory Heyman, a Jacob Javits fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for today's proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I would like to talk to my colleagues about the rescissions bill and also, in a broader context, about the situation with respect to education in the country.

I am going to run through a relatively large number of charts today, each of which is very significant and with a great deal of information involved. As time progresses through the spring, I will go over each of these areas in greater detail.

But I think now, as we begin talking about the rescission bill, it is important that we examine the cuts in the critical area of education.

When it becomes necessary to cut, it is easiest when everyone holds hands and says, "Oh, let's take our cuts and suffer together." However, in some cases, cuts may exacerbate the deficit problem, not ease it. Education is a critical item in this regard.

Earlier this year, business representatives from the Business Round Table, the National Alliance of Business, NAB, and the chamber of commerce approached me with concerns about the state of the work force and its ability to meet the increasing effective international competition.

As a result, this Wednesday, a summit will be held here in Washington

with business and education leaders, parent and student representatives, and political leaders.

I would like to share with you today the facts I will share with them on Wednesday. It is my hope that, when you review this information, you will agree that cutting educational funds could be most counterproductive to deficit reduction and for our future.

When the Berlin Wall came down, we all breathed a sigh of relief. But as we were beating against the wall over the decades since World War II, our economic competitors were beating us in entering into the evolving markets around the world. They now stand ready to meet the demands of the new markets of Asia, Eastern Europe, and the rest of the world.

Ours remains the most productive economy in the world, but our failing educational system and the inability to provide the necessary work force for our industry is seriously threatening our edge and our economic future.

Most worrisome is that the gap between our level of learning and that of our major competitors is increasing—that is, it is getting worse—not decreasing. Especially in the critical areas of math and science, American children trail their counterparts in Europe and Asia. And they are losing ground.

Let us take a look at the status of our education. I would remind everyone that in 1983, Secretary of Education Bell, under the Reagan administration, set forth "A Nation at Risk" and analyzed our educational system, analyzed where we stood in the world and declared that this Nation was at serious risk. In fact, he went on to say, in words of this nature, that if an enemy of this country had forced upon us the educational system that we have in this country today, we would consider it an act of war.

Since that time, 1983, a number of serious reports, documents and books have been written, all saying the same thing. We have had two summits since then. We established goals in 1989, which were adopted this past year, to determine where we must be in order to be competitive in the international world.

I think this first chart that I will show you, chart A, kind of says it all with respect to where we are with the rest of the world in those critical areas of math education. Look at it. You can hardly even see it is on the chart.

But the most startling aspect of this chart is to look at who No. 1 is—China—China, by far. And when you consider that it has a population of nearly 1.2 billion people and when you consider the serious deficit that we have in our trade with China, can you not help but be concerned that this is a serious problem.

But if you do not like that one, if you do not care about the international scene, if you do not think we have to worry about our market, take a look at

this next chart. This is the one which shakes me up the most.

This one says that over half of the high school students in this country who graduate are functionally illiterate. That means they are unable to perform basic tasks to get a job.

That is so startling to me that I cannot help but wonder whether or not this Nation is going to survive if we do not do something.

The business community is deeply concerned about this. In fact, there was a report that came out a few weeks ago, which was reported in the New York Times and elsewhere, which indicated that businesses do not even bother to interview high school graduates anymore. It is not worth their time. They are not educated enough. What business does then is spend some \$200 billion a year to train and educate their workers. I will show a chart later which illustrates the costs associated with a well-trained work force.

Let us take a look at where we stand. We established a goal under Goals 2000, that everyone shall be educated at least to meet certain basic standards. We set forth a curriculum and standards in the 1983 report, "A Nation at Risk." In 1990, only 22 percent of our high school graduates were adequately educated in the recommended core curriculum.

We have a serious problem. Yet, we have a hard time convincing many of that. I found myself going to my own local high school and asking the question:

"How are we doing?"

And they said, "We're doing fine."

Then they told me, "Well, our kids now are taking calculus and some of them are taking it in their junior year."

I said, "Wow, that's great, I didn't get it until I was in college."

However, the problem with that is if you are in Taiwan, Japan, or other areas, you are getting calculus in your freshman year. And one wonders why we are so far behind.

I think the only way we can get people to understand is to show the impact it is having upon the Nation as a whole. I feel in this Nation, we have a tendency—I know I do—to compare our school system with the one in the next county or our State with another State, but we fail to compare it with those of our competitors.

If you take a look at this chart, and you will see as we go through these charts, if we do not have an educated population and if you as an individual do not have an adequate education, you will not have an adequate earning capacity in this Nation, to give you the kind of lifestyle you desire.

This chart basically shows that education means a job, and the more education you have, the more money you are going to make during your life. It also indicates that about 25 percent of the people who are school dropouts, many of whom are also functionally il-

literate, have an extremely difficult time finding employment.

But as this shows, if you get a bachelor's degree your earning potential almost doubles; if you go up to a master's, it will double again. The point is if we do not have an educated population, if you are not well educated, you have a very limited earning potential.

Let us take a look now at the differences this means in the standard of living in this country. As I indicated, our education has not kept up. Our competitors are beating us. This is a chart which is used over and over again to show that in the last 20 years or more, the person who drops out of high school has seen a decrease of 35 percent—I repeat, a decrease of 35 percent—in their real income.

If you only have a high school diploma, you have seen an 18-percent decrease in your median family income, and if you had some college but did not graduate from college, there has been an 11-percent decrease over the last 20 years in your standard of living. Only those who went to college and beyond have seen an increase in their standard of living over the past 20 years. That is a sad commentary on where we are.

I think it is important that we keep this in mind and recognize that we have to improve the educational system. In a few moments, I will go on to explain what must be done and how I hope we can accomplish it.

Now let us get to the area we are discussing today and will be discussing in the next few months, and that is, what does the budget do, what impact does it have on our future budgets? What we find on this chart is that over half a trillion dollars in costs are suffered by this Nation because of a failed educational system.

Let me run through these figures. It costs \$225 billion to our businesses each year—\$225 billion each year—for remedial education, to teach the young people the things they should have learned up through high school, and for skill education, the things that they need to have to hold a job which will help us in our international competition in order to increase our Nation's productivity.

We spent \$208 billion for various welfare expenditures in this Nation. This is yet another reflection of what happens when people are not sufficiently educated. There are some 80 million functionally illiterate individuals in this country who cannot fully contribute to our economy; \$43 billion is the cost of crime to our society; incarceration costs anywhere from \$20,000 to \$60,000 per inmate, money which could be put to better use. Money is not the only way we suffer from crime; it also poses a danger to our society. Yet when we recognize that close to 80 percent of the people incarcerated are school dropouts, it indicates how extraordinary the impact of education is on our society.

We have \$200 billion for expenditures on our citizens for lost productivity as well as, I mentioned, training.

What I want to point out is if we decrease our expenditures in education, then we increase the social costs and in turn our deficit will grow. But equally important—it is not shown on this chart—is that if we did not have to pay for these undereducated individuals and if there was not the drain on the economy their lack of education caused, we would actually have \$125 billion more in revenue.

So when we cut back on education, we run the risk of not only increasing social costs but also decreasing the amount of revenues we will have at our disposal.

Let me go on and talk about the basic question which is relevant to the area of the deficit.

There are people who will say—and they are correct—that lack of money is not necessarily the problem and, in many cases, this is true. We spend more than any other society does, as a percentage of our gross national product, on education. But what we do not do is get our kids to learn as much as other young people do in this world.

Let us take a look at one of the areas that should graphically display why we are behind our international competitors. The only thing we need to look at in this country is the number of hours our kids spend watching television.

Look at that chart, it shows that we have far outpaced all of the other children in the world by the amount of time they spend on education, and yet we have the least amount of time spent on homework.

Yes, the problem is not just necessarily money. There is no question about it. A lot has to do with parents, a lot has to do with our culture, which sometimes puts leisure time and TV ahead of homework.

Let us take a look at the next chart. The next chart I want to point out is that even though we expend a lot more money than other countries do on our education, there are still areas we all agree are important and yet there are dire insufficiencies. For example, programs that assist lower-income individuals.

First of all, studies show that early intervention helps. A Michigan study, which was a 20-year longitudinal study, indicates that although kids will catch up in educational aspects, many who suffer for special education needs, will suffer social misadjustment. Yet all of those problems decrease substantially if you have a program like Head Start preschool education.

I remember when I first came to the Senate. A group of CEO's came to my office. I thought they would talk about tax relief, but they said the thing we need to do right away is to fully fund Head Start in order to get our educational system up to par. I will never forget that meeting because it made me fully aware of the educational needs of this Nation.

Title 1. That is, again, an educational program for low-achieving students in high-poverty areas, to help bring them up to par. Funding this program fully would be another \$12 billion a year.

Special education. I was on the committee that wrote the special education law in 1975. It was a necessity. The courts ruled that every child in America is entitled to an appropriate education. We wrote the law that established the national criteria to make sure that people would be in compliance with the Constitution. We said we would fund it at 40 percent of the total costs of special education in the country. If we were funding it at 40 percent right now, many educational needs would be met and schools would not be in the dire circumstances they are in. Some 44 States are in crisis, as far as funding education. That would cost us another \$11 billion a year if we were to fully fund the needs for special education—the funds that we promised our Nation when we passed that law many years ago.

To reach full funding for all three categories, it would require another \$31 billion a year. That is to increase costs in programs that everybody has agreed are essential and necessary to education.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I want to say that we are faced with serious problems with respect to the deficit of this Nation. We know that we have to bring down the cost of Government. But it is important to remember the importance of educational funding as we go forward. Right now, 50 percent of our young people do not have the basic requirements of education to meet the demands of this Nation in order to be ready for a job. That is intolerable.

Take a look at international competition. People out there are seizing our markets. At a time when markets are expanding rapidly in Asia, Eastern Europe, and central Asia, we are not ready and will not be ready unless we change right now the priority that education receives in this Congress and in the country.

As I said, we will be having a summit meeting this week on Wednesday and we will have leaders from all over the country who will be examining what we should do as a country to ensure that our work force is ready for the next century and that our industry, which has provided us with a bountiful living over many years in the past, will be there when we need it.

On the positive side, I note that recently we had six young men that were involved in an international math competition. They not only came in first, but they had perfect scores. But as I pointed out earlier on a chart, it is the average that counts. Our average is among the worst, not the best.

Mr. President, I have traveled to cities and around this country and I have found programs that swell my heart with pride, and I feel that there is hope and there are ways that we can succeed. But those examples are few and

far between. I have seen much more that indicates to me the frightful direction that our educational system is taking.

Mr. President, it is up to us in this body, in the Congress, to ensure that we do not do what is so tempting in these times of strife, and that is cut education along with other programs. We should do all we can to make sure that we bring education to a capacity that will meet our needs in the next century. Mr. President, if we do not help our kids, then this country will fail. I feel very strongly, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, that I have a responsibility to make sure this body is aware of what must be done.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to, at the outset, commend my friend and colleague from Vermont for the focus and attention he has placed in the area of education. I think all of us in this body know that he has been a real leader, along with my friend and colleague from Connecticut, Senator DODD, in trying to bring a much greater focus and attention about the importance of the total investment in education as a national priority. He has been prodding this institution—and I know the appropriators—to try to give that major focus and attention.

As chairman of the Education Committee now, he continues his work, not only in attempting to shape and refashion existing programs more efficiently, but also in terms of the priorities of investing in education. I welcome his strong and clear statement. It is a very important statement. I just want to say that it is one that should be listened to.

I think during the course of this week, after the disposition of the conference report, which I expect to be done in a very short period of time, we will be back on the broader issues of Senator DASCHLE's amendment and Senator DOLE's amendment; and then, if those are not successful, as I understand it, there will be additional opportunities later in the week to focus on different parts of the composite amendment, and in particular on education. So we will have some opportunity to, in a more exact way, address the priorities of education. I certainly am hopeful that we can reflect in our ultimate rescissions bill some of the priorities that he has talked about.

Mr. President, I wanted to just take a few moments of time to address some of the points that were made by my friend and colleague, the Senator from Oregon, about the various cuts that were being proposed and the impact there was going to be in terms of real people across the country.

I think there was reference made to the various provisions of the underlying amendment, which is the Daschle

amendment, which brings some restoration of the funding, or at least does not eliminate moneys that were authorized and appropriated. As I think the membership understands, we are not talking about additional appropriations. We are talking about appropriations that have already been made and now are being diminished, or have been targeted for reduction by the rescission program and the amendment which will be before the Senate again this afternoon, which will restore some of that funding in some of these key areas.

The Senator from Oregon was pointing out that really these cuts are not really so bad because they are not really cuts, but they are a reduction in the increase in expenditures. I know that is perhaps the desire of some and perhaps the intention of a number. But the fact of the matter is, particularly when you take a look at what is happening over in the House of Representatives, it is the Senator from Massachusetts talking about real cuts; it is, for example, the CBO that talks about some \$7 billion in current services, cuts in terms of the total nutrition programs, their estimate in terms of the nutrition programs. The Food Stamp Program would be cut some \$21 billion over the next 5 years.

So I think that, quite frankly, these are more than just a reduction in increases. You are going to have some real impact and effects in terms of what is happening in the local communities. That is what I am getting when I travel around my State of Massachusetts from people who have been working in the vineyards for a long period of time and have a good understanding and awareness of the various programs and what they mean in terms of the local communities.

Of course, when we talk about Head Start programs, as my friend and colleague from Illinois pointed out, we are only talking about 35 to 38 percent of the total eligible children who are receiving it. We are very far behind the curve.

I think the Senator from Vermont reviewed that in greater detail, as well as some of the other education priorities, such as the school nutrition programs.

Currently, schools participating in the lunch program are reimbursed for every lunch served to a child. Children from families with incomes at or below 130 percent of the poverty level are eligible for free meals. Children between 130 percent of poverty and 185 percent of poverty are eligible for reduced-price meals. Children over 185 percent of poverty pay full price.

The School Lunch Program operates in 95 percent of all public schools, representing 97 percent of all public school children. The cash reimbursement rates are \$1.75 for each free meal, \$1.35 for each reduced-price meal, and 17 cents for paid meals.

While reduced-price lunches must cost no more than 40 cents, no limits are imposed on the amount of money

that can be charged for a full-price meal. Some 25 million children participate in the School Lunch Program—at different levels, obviously, in terms of the support.

During the last recession, the number of school children receiving school lunches increased by 1.2 million.

We are now, even on the school lunch programs that are talked about in the House, that slack will not be picked up automatically in the School Lunch Program, but will be up to the whim of the priorities in the various States.

If we look at what has happened in the States, particularly with regard to children over the period of the last 10 years, 3 million more children are living in poverty in the last 4 years. No one can have a great deal of satisfaction that they are the ones whose needs will be attended to.

Currently, as the number of children eligible for free and reduced-price meals increases, the amount of Federal funds spent on the program increases. That is because we made a decision that meeting the nutritional needs of children is in our national interest and, therefore, all children who are eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch will be offered one. That fundamental national commitment has been altered or changed with the Republican block grant proposal.

With the block grants proposal, it says, well, we will leave it up to the States. We think the States will do that, but we are not saying, as a matter of national policy here in the Senate of the United States, that that is going to happen.

We might expect they will, we might hope they will, but we are not providing them either with the resources to do it or the guarantees that it will be done.

That is a major difference. We can quibble about all that we want in terms of what is happening, but the fact of the matter is, children will not get that fundamental guarantee, which is so important.

As I mentioned, the House proposal reverses that decision. Instead of guaranteeing every child a hot lunch—subsidized, of course, for those who cannot afford to pay for lunch—the House bill caps the amount of funds available for school-based nutrition programs, including school lunch.

So if the Republican position prevails, there will be no guarantee that a hungry child will be fed at school. There is no guarantee of that. There is now. That is a fundamental difference. Once the funds are used up by the States, that is it. Children are not guaranteed a lunch.

In fact, since the nutritional standards will be repealed if the House position prevails, the children fed will not meet the basic nutritional standards. We are not only repealing the guarantee, but we are repealing the nutritional standards.

As we pointed out before, the savings, so to speak, are being used for the tax cuts.

There is no flexibility built in for the economic emergencies, whether national, State, or local emergencies, and regardless of their nature. We will have repealed the entitlement nature of the program, replaced it with a cap amount of funding containing no adjustments for changes in the economy, population growth, or food price increases.

Some supporters of the block grants proposal try to make the argument that the block grants provide more children with school lunches. This is simply not plausible. To take a program that automatically provides schools with reimbursement for each child's meal based on a family income and replace it with a program that does not guarantee each child a meal, that does not adjust the funding based on the number of poor or low-income children needing lunch, that does not adjust for food price growth, is a cut in the program. It is a cut in the program, any way that you look at it.

If the number of poor and low-income children who need a school lunch grows beyond the funding that is authorized, children will have to be denied a free lunch or be required to pay more than they can afford, or receive an inferior lunch. Or maybe those who can pay will pay two, three, or four times as much as they do pay now, the sons and daughters of working families, as well.

Then we hear, well, there is more money in this program. More money compared to what? Compared to what CBO estimates is necessary to continue providing lunches to all school children who need them, like we do today?

No. According to the CBO, in fiscal year 1995, all child nutrition programs are funded at about \$11.6 billion. It is \$7.6 billion for child nutrition programs like school lunch, school breakfast program, summer food service; \$400 million for commodities; \$17 million for special milk; \$3.4 billion for WIC. Funding would drop to \$11.3 billion in fiscal year 1996 under the House Republican proposal; \$6.6 billion for the school-based nutrition program and \$4 billion for the family nutrition block grant.

That is a \$300 million cut, without even looking at inflation, without even looking at the 5-year numbers, without even looking at the fact that beyond food price growth, the school age population itself will grow by 4-percent to 6-percent during the next 5 years. And the 4 percent to 6 percent growth does not include adjustment for any type, in the event that the economy slows down or unemployment increases.

Mr. President, I just cannot accept that this is just a reduction here on the funding of programs that are meeting our needs. They just are not doing it. That is true not only on the nutrition programs, but also on the other programs.

I talked about the school lunch programs. And the rescission bill will reduce, in addition to the \$2.5 billion cut

from child care programs over 5 years in the House bill, will deny 378,000 children child care.

There are only 750,000—this is part of the child care program, very small child care return—but looking at the current situation, only 750,000 out of 8 million children eligible for child care currently receive assistance.

Many States have waiting lists for child care assistance that are simply astounding. GAO found waiting lists of 40,000 children in Texas and 255,000 children in California, taking as long as 2 or 3 years to get help in those States.

During 1993, Florida and Illinois each reported waiting lists of 25,000 children. A recent report by the Urban Institute found that it can take 5 years to get a child care slot in San Francisco. Birmingham, AL, alone has 5,000 families on a waiting list.

The idea that people can come to the floor and say, "We are cutting the existing child care program," that it has gone through the appropriations—we are trying to just have a very, very, modest return of a child care program, based upon those kinds of needs.

Try to find, for working families in my State of Massachusetts, child care for \$5,500. You will be lucky in any part of the State. Some are more costly in a number of communities. At the same time, we are putting pressure on these same parents to move out of a welfare situation—they may have small children and they want to work.

We have to ask, what is happening to the parents when they are not able to get child care? They are either not getting jobs or they are locking up their kids, or they are getting completely inadequate coverage for their children.

Quality child care creates opportunity and increases productivity—not just for one generation, but for two generations.

The GAO recently reported that assistance with child care makes it much more likely that low-income mothers will be able to work. And no wonder. The costs of child care consume over a quarter of the income of poor working families, as compared with just 7 percent of the income of nonpoor families. Without child care assistance, it is virtually impossible for many poor parents to go to work. What is happening out here is they are cutting back on these programs even more.

Child care is not about giving parents a blank check. It is about giving them a fair chance. Cutting children makes no sense. It will only pass the real life tragedy of dependency on from this generation to the next.

Families cannot afford that—and neither can we. That is why I support the restoration of funding for child care assistance for working families in the Daschle amendment.

The Senate rescission package also cuts \$35 million from the WIC Program, which provides nutrition assistance to 7 million low-income women and children. It has long received bipartisan support, because it saves money in

health costs in the long run by reducing the incidence of infant mortality and low-birthweight babies.

Since its inception, the WIC Program has been a stunning success. GAO has found that it has saved \$1 billion—\$1 billion—in medical expenses through the age of 18. We have spent \$300 million and saved \$1 billion. If that is not a wise investment for our Nation's children, I do not know what is.

Yet as many as 70,000 fewer children will be served by the WIC Program each month over a 12-month period as a result of this unjustifiable cut.

We are talking about, here, really is basically investment in children and good quality care. We are talking about WIC. We are talking about the Head Start Program, chapter 1, the drug-free schools. These are the programs we are trying to restore.

As I mentioned earlier in the course of the day, at a time when, evidently, we have seen the loss of \$3.6 billion, that has been lost somewhere in that conference, hopefully to be recovered at an early time, many of us are out here trying to restore these programs which are lifelines to the children in this country, it underscores the importance of the Daschle amendment.

In a March 7, 1995, Boston Globe editorial, Prof. T. Berry Brazelton of Harvard Medical School wrote:

Simply put, WIC works. And it works because it has forged an effective combination of state and federal involvement. The states administer the program, but under strict federal guidelines that ensure high nutrition standards, clear focus and consistent impact. The risk in our rush to right our nation's fiscal house is a loss of the very guidelines that have made WIC so successful.

Berry Brazelton, for those who have not either heard of him or read his articles, or listened to him on interviews, everyone who knows of his work with regard to children—he is really the Nation's favorite pediatrician. He is just an extraordinary human being who has appeared before our committees over a number of years and his words should be carefully considered and measured and, I think, adhered to.

Dr. Louis Sullivan, Secretary of Health and Human Services in the Bush administration, said in a Washington Post article:

... Among my concerns ... is that we may inadvertently strip programs of the national standards and guidelines that make them work. In the case of WIC, nutrition requirements guide the program toward better health, and Medicaid savings, while avoiding the potential confusion associated with creating a complex web of fifty state rules. Our children's health is not defined by state boundaries. Our nutritional standards should not be either.

He makes the point good nutrition in schools, the WIC programs, are matters of national responsibility. The WIC Program, as I know our Members understand, has been something that has been enormously important. There is a very modest return in the Daschle amendment for that particular program.

Both the House and the Senate rescission packages hit at-risk youth very hard: 80 percent of funding for year-round youth programs—the principal training and employment assistance for poor out-of-school youth—would be cut. Overall youth funding would be cut by about 40 percent, and the number of youth served would be reduced by over half. The impact of these rescissions is compounded by the likelihood that the cuts may be permanent, meaning that for the next several years close to a million fewer youth each year will be served.

We are in the process now of working to improve many of the youth training programs. We have 400,000 children every year who are dropping out of our high schools. They are a source of unrest in many of our local communities.

We have woefully too few programs or efforts to try to reach out to these young people. What we are trying to work through now, with Senator KASSEBAUM, is to utilize the school-to-work programs for the 70 percent of the children who do not go on into higher education. We want to work with the private sector in a partnership to move these young men and women into employment and also, as you develop those programs, to try to reach out to a number of the young people who may have dropped out of schools to bring them into the process as well.

If you emasculate the existing programs, our chance to once again reach out to young people who are basically those at the highest risk in terms of the criminal element in our society will not come to fruition. It is serious, important, bipartisan efforts that are being worked through now. It seems, with the dramatic kinds of cuts that are suggested here, we will basically undermine, in a very significant way, some of the very useful work I think can still take place.

Mr. President, I know others want to speak on the floor on these measures.

Let me just say I am very hopeful we will move towards the completion of the conference report, that we will have an opportunity to vote on a resolution, which will hopefully be supported by Republicans and Democrats alike, that will address the tax loophole that has been identified and which was addressed by the Finance Committee earlier. I hope that we will be afforded that opportunity, and that Republicans and Democrats together will work to support that resolution.

As we have heard, the majority leader and others, Republicans and Democrats, say it is their desire to address it. I am more than glad to do it. It is a sense of the Senate that:

The Congress of the United States shall act as quickly as possible to amend the Internal Revenue Code to end the tax avoidance by U.S. citizens to relinquish their United States citizenship.

And the effective date of such amendment to the Internal Revenue Code should be February 6, 1995.

That statement has been incorporated by the majority leader, the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from New York, and others on the Finance Committee as they desire. I hope we could either act on this resolution or a joint leadership resolution of the majority and minority leaders that would incorporate that concept.

I do not believe there has to be additional debate and discussion about it. We have had a chance to talk about it. Let us set a time to be able to do it. Let us send a message at the time that we are going to be debating the rescission package and the Daschle amendment that we can afford to cut these programs for children—WIC, the school lunch, the Head Start Programs—but we still cannot agree to close the loophole that is worth \$3.6 billion.

I think the American people just cannot and will not understand it. I am very hopeful that we will be able to do it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, let me commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for what he is talking to now of fundamental programs that constitute investments—not spending—to save spending, to eliminate deficits. If there is one misgiving that we have with the ongoing exercise of the Contract With America—and it is good to bring in a new group and have a tonic, to turn our attention to where savings can be had—but in the zeal to try to bring about certain savings there is a mix of arrogance and more or less mob action pellmell for hell, let us just cut it all, everything, without any idea of what really saves money and what costs money.

For instance, for every dollar spent on women, infants and children feeding we save at least \$3. For every dollar spent on Head Start we save \$4.75. For every dollar spent on title I education for the disadvantaged we save another \$6.50.

And having experienced government over the years, I have learned what saves money. For example, I had a problem 25 years ago with my own State on the subject of hunger and feeding. I had made a mistake as Governor. I had not paid too much attention to the hungry. In fact, a rejoinder had been given to me by my friend, the senior Senator, "Well, there was hunger and the hungry in the days of Christ, and there will be hunger in the days after we are long gone, and it is almost a given." Not so. Not so at all.

At that time, I met and studied with those in the medical profession and in the nutrition discipline—Dr. Neville Scrimshaw at Harvard, Dr. Cravioto at Cornell, later at Columbia University, and Dr. Charles Upton Lowe, the chairman of the Committee on Nutrition of the American Academy of Pediatrics at that particular time. They had found

that every adult has 13 billion brain cells in the cortex, and 10 billion of the 13 billion develop in the first 5 months in the mother's womb.

However, there is as much as 20 percent less cellular development of those brain cells resulting from the lack of nutrition, the lack of synthesis of those nerve cells, and the lack of protein. It is much like taking a television set off the desk here and dropping it on the floor, putting it back here, and turning it on. The hundreds of wires of circuitry do not join, do not connect. And in the field of brain medicine, they call that organized or general brain damage. That child is stultified in the first 5 months in the mother's womb and comes into this world with organic, or generalized, brain injury, lacking an ability, if you please, to concentrate, to assimilate, to be educable in the fullest of senses.

So I joined with Senator Humphrey after he came out of the Vice Presidency back into the Senate. I was not on the Agriculture Committee at that time. But we talked of this problem that we had in women, infants, and children's feeding. We found out that if we rendered protein supplements for expectant mothers, which now cost in the vicinity of around \$400 over the 9-month period, we could save practically \$30,000.

I just visited in the university hospital in my own hometown, the Children's Hospital at the Medical University of South Carolina. They had some 85 low-birth-weight infants. In my early days they would have been unaccounted for and lost; little low-birth-weight infants of 1½ pounds, 2 pounds, 2½ pounds. They had nurses around the clock. I will never forget it. It cost some \$15 million to keep some 85 nurses going around the clock treating those little infants. The average stay for a low-birth-weight infant on that incubator in intensive care is 30 days at \$1,000 a day, or \$30,000.

So this is not a sick call by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for liberal spending programs. This is a studied investment by liberals, conservatives, Republicans, and Democrats alike to spend now to save billions later. That is the one misgiving I have about this so-called Contract With America because its proponents have no sensibility. They come here on the first day and all of sudden they have wisdom. Without any experience or a day in public service whatever, never having listened and learned anything, in a fell swoop they come in with across-the-board so-called spending cuts that actually will cost us billions.

Mr. President, when that baby comes in as a low-birth-weight infant, like it or not, it is yours and mine. We are going to take care of it in some children's hospital, in some intensive care unit, and for the wealthy parent or the poor, that cost is really going to the general public.

So we need to stop these penny-wise, pound-foolish cuts to preventive pro-

grams. We should never think in terms of tax cuts here for billionaires who have made their wealth in America and then renounce their citizenship in order to avoid taxes. It is almost a treasonous kind of activity in this Senator's mind and never should be dignified or recognized in law as a worthy project when we are going around cutting spending.

I am for cutting spending. I am for freezing spending. I am for closing loopholes, and I am for taxes. I have challenged this body and all Senators to give me their realistic budget plans since January. I will never forget the distinguished chairman on the House side of the Budget Committee, Congressman KASICH. On December 18, 1994, on a national TV program he came on and said, "Don't worry about it. We don't care what the President puts in. We have three budgets before us. We are going to introduce them. But before we have tax cuts in January we are going to have the spending cuts and have this budget."

Well, it is now April. It is going to be May or June before they get around to specifying their cuts. I met that particular challenge in January. I worked with the best of minds. I have introduced a list of cuts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at least four times by now that shows that in order to get on a glidepath of balancing the budget by the year 2002, you have to cut \$37 billion in domestic discretionary spending in the first year. Even with those reductions, the interest cost rises faster than the cuts. That is the only good, solid, credible attempt I have seen to show the kinds of cuts that are necessary, and I do not think I could vote for them all. And cuts of even this severity would require 7 years to reach a balanced budget.

I remember when President Reagan came to town. He said he was going to balance the budget in 1 year. Then, after he got in town, he said, "Oops. This is way worse than I thought. It is going to take me 2, maybe 3 years." So the Budget Committee started submitting 3-year budgets. Then by the mid 1980's, the committee said "Whoops, it got worse. We are going to have 5-year budgets." Now they have 7-year budgets. And I can tell you, after a few more years, they are going to have 10-year budgets. It is like a football game where they keep moving the goalpost.

A sincere effort to balance the budget will not cut out basic investments that save money in the long run. Realistically, it is going to take taxes as well as spending cuts, spending freezes, and loophole closings.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts has really brought a sobering moment to this body that allows us to understand that the proposals before us do not save money. Oh, the national media, lazy as they are, are running around saying that this rescissions bill has so much in spending cuts, and they

refer to these fine investment programs as cuts. But I can tell you, when you consider the costs to Medicaid, to the hospitals, to the schools, to the workplace and the economy, and on down the line, you will find that the proposed cuts actually increase spending. This is the lesson of those children at the medical university.

So I hope we can listen to this debate and understand that the Senate is not just in a race to get so many marks on the so-called Contract With America or whatever it is. It is a serious job of trying to cut back on overall spending while investing in programs that will save money in the long run.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I strongly support the conference report to H.R. 831, the Self-Employed Health Care Deduction Act.

There are approximately 9 million self-employed business owners representing almost 10 percent of the working population. These individuals are employed in all types of industries: from mining and service industries to construction and manufacturing. They are the entrepreneurial small business men and women that spur our national economic growth. These are the individuals that embody the American dream. This provision is critical to their survival.

My offices have been inundated with hundreds of calls from concerned taxpayers around Pennsylvania urging the Congress to reinstate the deduction. These callers are just a fraction of the 9 million self-employed taxpayers that are relying on us to pass this measure as quickly as possible so they can continue to utilize this deduction for the 1994 tax year.

Mr. President, I have consistently supported this deduction for the self-employed. In the 103d and the 104th Congresses, I introduced legislation to provide targeted health-care reform. One of the major provisions I included in that bill was 100 percent deductibility for health insurance for the self-employed. Under current law, businesses are permitted to deduct 100 percent of what they pay for the health insurance of their employees, but self-employed individuals may not deduct any of their cost because that provision expired on December 31, 1993. It is hard to find a provision in the Internal Revenue Code that is more discriminatory than this one.

According to the Congressional Research Service, 3.9 million uninsured workers are self-employed. Providing full deductibility of health insurance premiums, beginning with reinstatement of the 25 percent deduction for 1994 and researching 100 percent by 1993 for self-employed individuals is a simple matter of fairness. It should also make health insurance coverage more affordable for the estimated 3.9 million self-employed individuals and their families who are now uninsured.

On January 19, 1995, I signed a letter along with 74 of my colleagues to Ma-

jority Leader DOLE and Minority Leader DASCHLE urging them to reinstate this expired provision. I believed then, as I do now, that the interests of hard-working Americans need to be a top priority before the U.S. Senate.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the reinstatement of this provision. This legislation is an important first step in providing tax fairness to our Nations' self-employed business owners.

I thank my colleagues and I yield the floor.

(At the request of Mr. DOLE, the following statement was printed in the RECORD.)

• Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce my strong support for H.R. 831 which would permanently extend the deduction for health insurance costs for self-employed individuals. This legislation will allow, on a permanent basis, self-employed small business owners, sole proprietorships, and partnerships to deduct a portion of their health insurance costs for tax purposes. This legislation will assist those small businesses which are so vital to the economy of my State of Oregon, as well as the rest of the Nation. I am pleased that the 104th Congress is about to address this issue on a permanent basis. •

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today we take a step forward to correct a situation adversely affecting small businesses and farmers which I have many times called an absurdity.

During this tax filing season, over 9 million self-employed small businesses and farmers will fill out their tax returns. And when they do, they will learn first hand of how this absurdity affects them and their family. The absurdity I am speaking of Mr. President is that no part of their health insurance premiums are deductible in their 1994 tax return due April 17—just over 3 weeks from today.

This in contrast to owners of large corporations that have a permanent 100 percent deduction, and that typically pay smaller health care premiums because of their size. It is a double penalty Mr. President. A double penalty on innovators and job creators in our economy—people who should be encouraged, not penalized.

Mr. President, this inequity must be corrected and it must be corrected quickly. This should be a high priority for this Congress, and I am very happy that we are taking up this matter today.

I want to comment briefly on one aspect of this bill which is extremely important—and that is this deduction for health insurance will be made permanent.

Many times we focus on the amount of the percentage deduction. In the past it has been 25 percent, and today's bill increases that percentage to 30 percent which is a very positive step toward the goal of a 100 percent deduction which I hope we will continue to work toward. In fact, Senator GRASS-

LEY, Senator ROTH and I introduced legislation in January of this year to achieve a 100 percent deduction by 1997, and I look forward to working with them again in the future to meet this goal.

But Mr. President, I cannot stress enough the importance of making this deduction permanent, and this is borne out by the history of the deduction.

In 1986, the self-employed were first given 25 percent deductibility as part of the Tax Reform Act of 1986—with the understanding that it would be eventually increased to 100 percent, the same deduction incorporated business enjoy.

In the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the deduction was extended for 9 months. In 1990, 25 percent deductibility was extended through 1991. And in 1991, 25 percent deductibility was extended through June 30, 1992. Mr. President, each time we scrambled to reinstate the deduction—uncertainty surrounding the deduction was high, and it was shameful to treat the self-employed in this way.

But on June 30, 1992, the worst scenario happened—the deduction expired. Small businesses and farmers could not deduct the cost of their health insurance. The 1992 tax season came and went and still there was no reinstatement of the deduction because of the difficulty of moving any tax bill. Then, in August 1993, as part of the Budget Reconciliation Act, the deduction was retroactively reinstated from July 1, 1992, to December 31, 1993. Self-employed were required to amend their 1992 returns to take the deduction, and no doubt some failed to do so and lost their deduction.

So that brings us to 1994 when the deduction once again expired, and no bill has been moved to correct the inequity—until today. Mr. President, this uncertainty is unpardonable and it must not happen again. Under this legislation the deduction will never again expire—it is permanent.

Mr. President, we all understand the difficulty of moving a tax bill on the Senate floor where any of the 100 Senators my offer any amendment with no time limit. So that is why I and my friend and colleague on the Finance Committee, Senator ROTH, sought signatures on a January 19, 1995, letter to Senator DOLE and Senator DASCHLE stating that we would “not support or offer any amendments to the legislation” should they schedule it for Senate floor action.

We were pleased to obtain 75 of our colleagues' signatures, and I am even more pleased today that no amendments will be offered and we will agree to the bill on a voice vote. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter be printed in the RECORD, and I thank my colleagues for putting aside some issues very important to them in order to correct this problem and quickly as possible.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, January 19, 1995.

Hon. ROBERT DOLE,
Senate Majority Leader,
Hon. THOMAS DASCHLE,
Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE AND SENATOR DASCHLE: We are writing to you regarding the need to extend the 25% deduction for health insurance for the self-employed, which expired at the end of 1993. As you know, more than 9 million self-employed business owners, representing almost 10% of the working population, lost the ability to take this deduction when the law expired. It is our hope that the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee will soon take up this legislation as a stand-alone bill, and that the House will soon pass this bill and send it to the Senate.

In order that we may move as expeditiously as possible, we are writing to assure you that if you receive this legislation, and if you schedule it for Senate floor action, we will not support or offer any amendments to the legislation. As many of these small business men and women begin to file their 1994 tax returns, we believe that it is essential that Congress act now to avoid the administrative difficulties that could arise from amended returns if the legislation is not passed until after April 15th. Thank you for your consideration.

David Pryor; Don Nickles; Jesse Helms; Arlen Specter; Bill Roth; Chuck Grassley; Dirk Kempthorne; John Warner; Mitch McConnell; Ted Stevens; Kit Bond; Dale Bumpers; Chuck Robb; Paul Simon; Carol Moseley-Braun; Joe Lieberman; J. James Exon; Connie Mack; Bob Kerrey; John McCain; J. Bennett Johnston; Harry Reid; Wendell Ford; Kent Conrad; Sam Nunn; Ernest Hollings; Jeff Bingaman; Max Baucus; Kay Bailey Hutchison; Spencer Abraham; Bryon L. Dorgan; Dan Coats; Patrick Leahy; Herb Kohl; Barbara A. Mikulski; John Ashcroft; John Glenn; John F. Kerry; Bob Graham; Hank Brown; Jay Rockefeller; Mark Hatfield; Dianne Feinstein; Howell Heflin; Ben Nighthorse Campbell; Slade Gorton; Fred Thompson; Al Simpson; John H. Chafee; Trent Lott; Larry Pressler; Larry E. Craig; Olympia Snowe; Lauch Faircloth; Rod Grams; Rick Santorum; R.F. Bennett; Dick Lugar; Jim Jeffords; Conrad Burns; Paul D. Coverdell; Richard H. Bryan; Bill Frist; Craig Thomas; Jim Inhofe; Mike DeWine; Jon Kyl; Strom Thurmond; Bob Smith; Phil Gramm; John Breaux; Richard Shelby; Orrin Hatch; Bill Cohen; Patty Murray.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we have before us the conference report to H.R. 831, permanent deduction of health insurance costs of self-employed individuals. Passage of this conference report today will help 3.2 million self-employed Americans across the Nation get one step closer to deducting a portion of their health insurance costs.

The House has already passed this conference report. There are only 14 more days to April 17—tax day. And the clock's ticking. It is critical that this bill be signed into law prior to that day.

Since 1986, Congress has allowed the self-employed a 25-percent deduction for their health care insurance costs.

Almost every year, we have had to extend the deduction, but we failed to extend it last year when it expired on December 31, 1993. Mr. President, H.R. 831 makes the deduction permanent. We don't want to leave the 3.2 million tax filers in 1994, hanging on the edge of a cliff every year. And we don't want to tell them that although corporations can deduct 100 percent of their health care insurance costs, small businesses cannot. We decided 9 years ago that in order to make the playing field more equitable, we should allow small businesses to deduct their health care insurance costs. H.R. 831 allows them to deduct 30 percent of their annual health care insurance costs.

Mr. President, I want to say to many of my colleagues that the 3.2 million Americans we help today are farmers and small business owners that live and work all across America. Although we were able to raise the percentage of their annual health insurance costs that they can deduct from 25 to 30 percent, I am disappointed that we were unable to raise this level even higher. It was my strong desire that we should have been able to do so. But, we have been able to make this deduction a permanent one, so that these Americans will no longer have to worry about whether or not they will be able to take the deduction next year.

EXPATRIATE PROVISION

Mr. President, included in the Senate version of H.R. 831 was a proposal to tax U.S. citizens who renounce citizenship. But, the measure was adopted without the benefit of hearings.

Subsequently, the Finance Committee's Oversight Subcommittee held a preliminary hearing. The House also held a hearing on this issue earlier this week. This proposal raises important questions, and the hearing exposed some serious concerns.

It is vital to enact H.R. 831, vital. But it is premature to enact this expatriate tax provision. We cannot delay action on H.R. 831 while we continue to consider alternatives to this expatriate provision.

Let me be clear on this—because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to believe that we are somehow opponents of the expatriate provision. We want to get this done. And it is clear that it will be effective as of February 6—but there are some serious problems with this provision, so we will not enact it today. The conferees on the bill have asked the Joint Committee on Taxation to study the provision and to look at other alternatives and get back to us by June 1, 1995. And so, I would say to my colleagues that this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, asking us to do what we are already doing, is nothing but a filibuster. A tactic to waste time that we can ill-afford.

OFFSETTING REVENUES

We primarily pay for the deduction by repealing a Federal Communications Commission [FCC] program that I believe is not only ineffective, but

costs the Federal Government billions of dollars.

THE FCC'S TAX CERTIFICATE PROGRAM

Congress, in 1943, gave the FCC authority to grant tax deferrals to owners of broadcast facilities who were forced to sell their properties to break up monopolies during World War II.

In 1978, the FCC expanded this provision to give a tax preference to radio, television, and later cable broadcasters who sold their properties to minority-owned firms. For this policy, the FCC defines minorities as including blacks, Hispanics, American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, and Pacific Islanders.

The greatest flaw in this program is that the economic benefit doesn't go to the minority buyer, the economic benefit goes to the seller. It's like a kick-back. If you sell to me and not the other guy, I'll give you a little extra something. And I won't be paying for it, the American taxpayer will. I don't understand it, and I don't understand why people would think this is benefiting minorities when the monetary gain is going to the seller.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Now, don't get me wrong. I am proud of my civil rights record. And I have supported affirmative action in the past—that's no secret. But my record does not disqualify me from raising legitimate questions about the continuing fairness and effectiveness of affirmative action—particularly when the affirmative-action label is used to describe quotas, set-asides, and other group preferences.

Equal treatment, not preferential treatment, should be the standard. Equal opportunity, not equal results, must be the goal.

Last week, as we debated this same bill on the Senate floor, my distinguished colleague from Maine, Senator COHEN, gave a very eloquent speech where he pointed out that America is not a color-blind society, and he's right.

Discrimination continues to exist. The color-blind ideal is just that—an ideal that has yet to be achieved in the America of 1995. But, Mr. President, do you become a color-blind society by dividing people by race? Do you achieve the color-blind ideal by granting preferences to people simply because they happen to belong to certain groups? Do you continue programs that have outlived their usefulness or original purpose? The answer to these questions is, of course, a resounding "no."

The debate over affirmative action can be an opportunity to unite the American people—not divide us.

CONCLUSION

What we will accomplish here today is taking a million dollar, unjustifiable tax break, for millionaires, not minorities, and turn them into health care for ordinary Americans. Americans who really need it.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this conference report.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the conference report?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I would simply like to state for the RECORD the fact that the Committee on Finance, in dealing with the provisions on the payment of tax by persons who expatriate, was confronted by mixed assessments of the legality of such an action.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the United States ratified in 1992, article 12, section 2 states: "Everyone shall be free to leave any country, including his own." The question is whether there is a restriction on this right.

The point here is that present law provides that any taxpayer that renounces his or her citizenship for tax avoidance purposes is subject to the current tax on gains on U.S. assets for 10 years. This has been the law for roughly 30 years, but it has not been enforced. It probably has not been enforceable. Regulations have never been issued. And we mean to do, we mean to do.

The President proposed this on February 6 in his budget, and what we will do in the end will be applied as of February 6. There will be no windows, no provisions of that kind.

Just that the record might show that we have been trying to be orderly and have had some sense of due process here, on 24 March, I received a letter from Hurst Hannum, associate professor of international law at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, of whose eminence I need hardly to remind the Senate, in which he wrote to express his serious concern over the proposed exit tax and the issue which he had addressed in his 1987 book, "The Right to Leave and Return in International Law and Practice."

We responded to him with information he wanted further on the matter. He writes on March 31 to say:

As I noted then, what appeared to be the imposition of a tax solely on the ground that a person was renouncing his or her citizenship could interfere with the right . . . [under article 12 of the Covenant].

He says, "I am gratified that the human rights issues related to this bill have become a subject of serious debate."

I said on Friday—it was commented on in our hearing—when we are dealing with civil rights issues, human rights issues, we must never be more careful than when the group involved is a dispersed group.

I very much regret that the daily talking points of the Democratic Policy Committee today said what Democrats believe—"We believe that education for our children should not be cut." Fine, I so agree. "Especially while billionaire Benedict Arnolds are allowed to escape taxation." They are not going to escape taxation. I am not sure they are Benedict Arnolds. They are people making decisions that they have a right to make under international law, and the United States has the right to collect taxes from them, under our law.

We now have a letter from Professor Hannum that says:

In sum, imposition of a nondiscriminatory tax on accrued income at the time citizenship is renounced, in a manner consistent with the way in which that same income would be treated at the time of death, does not appear to me to violate either the internationally protected right to emigrate or the (somewhat less well protected) right to a nationality.

Mr. President, I ask that the letters be printed in the RECORD, and I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUFTS UNIVERSITY,

Medford, MA, March 24, 1995.

Re: Tax Compliance Act of 1995, H.R. 981.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: I am writing to express my serious concern over the proposed "exit tax" included in Sec. 201 of H.R. 981. This concern is based not on an evaluation of its tax consequences, an area in which I am not an expert, but rather on the possible inconsistency of the tax with fundamental international human rights norms and U.S. international legal obligations.

As you know, the U.S. is now a party to the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, article 12 of which guarantees the right of everyone "to leave any country, including his own." By coincidence, the United States will present its first report on compliance with the Covenant to the Human Rights Committee in New York next week.

Although I understand that the "exit tax" is based on renunciation of citizenship rather than on leaving the country, it is difficult to see how one can "punish" the former without seriously compromising the latter. Indeed, the imposition of confiscatory taxes has been a policy pursued by many countries to discourage emigration, whether on purported national security grounds, specious economic arguments, or to prevent "brain drain." I address these and other issues in my 1987 book, "The Right to Leave and Return in International Law and Practice" (Martinus Nijhoff).

In 1986, a meeting of eminent American and European legal experts adopted the "Strasbourg Declaration on the Right to Leave and Return," a copy of which I attach for your information. I would particularly draw your attention to article 5, which states, *inter alia*, that "[a]ny person leaving a country shall be entitled to take out of that country . . . his or her personal property * * * [and] all other property or the proceeds thereof, subject only to the satisfaction of legal monetary obligations, such as maintenance obligations to family members, and to general controls imposed by law to safeguard the national economy, provided that such controls do not have the effect of denying

the exercise of the right." The tax in question would not appear to meet these standards.

Without having examined the provisions of Sec. 201 in greater detail, I cannot state definitively that it would violate international law. However, the human rights implications of such a provision appear to be extremely serious, and adoption of the law would seem, at best, to be hypocritical, given the legitimate and consistent U.S. insistence on free emigration from other countries over the years.

I hope that the Senate will examine these issues with great deliberation before it decides to balance the budget on the back of individual rights.

Yours sincerely,

HURST HANNUM,

Associate Professor of International Law.

APPENDIX F

STRASBOURG DECLARATION ON THE RIGHT TO LEAVE AND RETURN

(Adopted on 26 November 1986)

PREAMBLE

The Meeting of Experts on the Right to Leave and Return,

Recognising that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is essential for peace, justice and well-being and is necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and co-operation among all states;

Recalling that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, as well as regional conventions, recognize the fundamental principle, based on general international law, that everyone has the right to leave any country, including one's own, and to return to one's own country;

Emphasizing that the right of everyone to leave any country and to enter one's own country is indispensable for the full enjoyment of all civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights;

Concerned that the denial of this right is the cause of widespread human suffering, a source of international tensions, and an object of international concern;

Adopts the following Declaration:

Article 1

Everyone has the right to leave any country, including one's own, temporarily or permanently, and to enter one's own country, without distinction as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, marriage, age (except for unemancipated minors independently of their parents), or other status.

Article 2

Every state shall adopt such legislative or other measures as may be necessary to ensure the full and effective enjoyment of the rights set forth in this Declaration.

All laws, administrative regulations or other provisions affecting the enjoyment of these rights shall be published and made easily accessible.

Article 3

(a) No person shall be subjected to any sanction, penalty, reprisal or harassment for seeking to exercise or for exercising the right to leave a country, such as acts which adversely affect, *inter alia*, employment, housing, residence status or social, economic or educational benefits.

(b) No person shall be required to renounce his or her nationality in order to leave a country, nor shall a person be deprived of nationality for seeking to exercise or for exercising the right to leave a country.

(c) No person shall be denied the right to leave a country on the grounds that that person wishes to renounce or has renounced his or her nationality.

Article 4

(a) No restriction may be imposed on the right to leave except those which are

(1) provided by law;

(2) necessary to protect national security, public order (*ordre public*), public health or morals or the rights and freedoms of others; and

(3) consistent with internationally recognized human rights and other international legal obligations.

Any such restriction shall be narrowly construed.

(b) Any restriction on the right to leave shall be clear, specific and not subject to arbitrary application.

(c) A restriction shall be considered "necessary" only if it responds to a pressing public and social need, pursues a legitimate aim and is proportionate to that aim.

(d) A restriction based on "national security" may be invoked only in situations where the exercise of the right poses a clear, imminent and serious danger to the State. When this restriction is invoked on the ground that an individual acquired military secrets, the restriction shall be applicable only for a limited time, appropriate to the specific circumstances, which should not be more than five years after the individual acquired such secrets.

(e) A restriction based on "public order (*ordre public*)" shall be directly related to the specific interest which is sought to be protected. "Public order (*ordre public*)" means the universally accepted fundamental principles, consistent with respect for human rights, on which a democratic society is based.

(f) A restriction based on "the rights and freedoms of others" shall not imply that relatives (except for parents with respect to unemancipated minors), employers or other persons may prevent, by withholding their consent, the departure of any person seeking to leave a country.

(g) No fees, taxes or other exactions shall be imposed for seeking to exercise or exercising the right to leave a country, with the exception of nominal fees related to travel documents.

(h) Permissibility of restrictions on the right to leave is subject to international scrutiny. The burden of justifying any such restriction lies with the state.

Article 5

(a) Any person leaving a country shall be entitled to take out of that country

1. his or her personal property, including household effects and property connected with the exercise of that person's profession or skill;

2. all other property or the proceeds thereof, subject only to the satisfaction of legal monetary obligations, such as maintenance obligations to family members, and to general controls imposed by law to safeguard the national economy, provided that such controls do not have the effect of denying the exercise of the right.

(b) Property or the proceeds thereof which cannot be taken out of the country shall remain vested in the departing owner, who shall be free to dispose of such property or proceeds within the country.

RIGHT TO ENTER OR RETURN

Article 6

(a) No one shall be deprived of the right to enter his or her own country.

(b) No person shall be deprived of nationality or citizenship in order to exile or to prevent that person from exercising the right to enter his or her country.

(c) No entry visa may be required to enter one's own country.

Article 7

Permanent legal residents who temporarily leave their country of residence shall not be arbitrarily denied the right to return to that country.

Article 8

On humanitarian grounds, a state should give sympathetic consideration to permitting the return of a former resident, in particular a stateless person, who has maintained strong bona fide links with that state.

PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS

Article 9

Everyone has the right to obtain such travel or other documents as may be necessary to leave any country or to enter one's own country. Such documents shall be issued free of charge or subject only to nominal fees.

Article 10

(a) Any national procedures or requirements affecting the exercise of the rights set forth in this Declaration shall be established by law or administrative regulations adopted pursuant to law.

(b) Everyone shall have the right to communicate as necessary with any person, including foreign consular or diplomatic officials, for the realization of the rights set forth in this Declaration.

(c) No state shall refuse to issue the documents referred to in Article 9 or shall otherwise impede the exercise of the right to leave, on the grounds of the applicant's inability to present authorization to enter another country.

(d) Procedures for the issuance of the documents referred to in Article 9 shall be expeditious and shall not be unreasonably lengthy or burdensome.

(e) Everyone filing an application for any document referred to in Article 9 shall be entitled to obtain promptly a duly certified receipt for the application filed. Decisions regarding issuance of such documents shall be taken within a reasonable period of time specified by law. The applicant shall be promptly informed in writing of any decision denying, withdrawing, canceling or postponing issuance of any such document; the specific reasons therefor; the facts upon which the decision is based; and the administrative or other remedies available to appeal the decision.

(f) The right to appeal to a higher administrative or judicial authority shall be provided in all instances in which the right to leave or enter is denied. The appellant shall have a full opportunity to present the grounds for the appeal, to be represented by counsel of his or her choice, and to challenge the validity of any fact upon which a denial or restriction has been founded. The results of any appeal, specifying the reasons for the decision, shall be communicated promptly in writing to the appellant.

FINAL CLAUSES

Article 11

Any person claiming a violation of his or her rights set forth in this Declaration shall have effective recourse to a judicial or other independent tribunal to seek enforcement of those rights.

Article 12

No state may impede communication by any person with an international organization or other bodies or persons outside the state with regard to the rights set forth in this Declaration, and no sanction, penalty, reprisal or harassment may be imposed on anyone exercising this right of communication.

Article 13

The enjoyment of the rights set forth in this Declaration shall not be limited because

of activities protected under internationally recognized human rights or other international legal obligations.

Article 14

Nothing in this Declaration shall be interpreted as implying for any state, group or person any right to engage in any activity or perform any act aimed at destroying any of the rights set forth herein or at limiting them to a greater extent than is provided for in this Declaration.

Article 15

The present Declaration shall not be interpreted to limit the enjoyment of any human right protected by international law.

TUFTS UNIVERSITY,

Medford, MA, March 31, 1995.

Re Tax Compliance Act of 1995, H.R. 981.

Attention: Patricia McClanahan.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: I wrote you on 24 March expressing my concern over the possible human rights implications of the so-called "exit tax" called for in the above-referenced bill. As I noted then, what appeared to be the imposition of a tax solely on the ground that a person was renouncing his or her citizenship could interfere with the right of every person "to leave any country, including his own," which is guaranteed under article 12 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

I am gratified that the human rights issues related to this bill have become a subject of serious debate, and I appreciate your contribution to that debate. Having now received additional and more specific information about the tax, however, I have become convinced that neither its intention nor its effect would violate present U.S. obligations under international law.

Although imposition of a special tax on those who wished to renounce U.S. citizenship might be questionable, it is my understanding that the tax in question is based on accrued income and, in effect, treats renunciation of citizenship as the financial equivalent of death for the purpose of attaching tax liability. There are undoubtedly negative consequences to the individual concerned in having to pay taxes on gains while he or she is alive rather than after death, but there is no internationally protected right to escape taxation by changing citizenship. However, in order to clarify that the purpose and effect of the proposed tax are non-discriminatory, the language might be rewritten to offer the individual the option of complying with the new tax or electing to have realized gains taxed only as part of the individual's estate—subject to an appropriate escrow account being established for money which would otherwise be expected to be beyond U.S. jurisdiction at the time of death.

In sum, imposition of a non-discriminatory tax on accrued income at the time citizenship is renounced, in a manner consistent with the way in which that same income would be treated at the time of death, does not appear to me to violate either the internationally protected right to emigrate or the (somewhat less well protected) right to a nationality.

Thank you for the opportunity to clarify my views on this important matter.

Yours sincerely,

HURST HANNUM,

Associate Professor of International Law.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I believe we are ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question occurs on agreeing to the conference report.

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. What is the pending bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business will be H.R. 1158.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. I now ask for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed 15 minutes, with the Senator from Washington being permitted to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I must rise today to support a program that some in this body may argue is unnecessary, but that the American people wholeheartedly support.

As we debate the very difficult question of eliminating funds to various agencies, it frustrates me that some of my colleagues blindly lump the Corporation for Public Broadcasting into a general pool of rescissions.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting is a true public service, owned by the American people. What other Government program can we claim reaches 99 percent of all Americans?

Since 1967, CPB has developed public telecommunications services of the highest quality to serve the American people. All of us on this floor agonize over what serves the taxpayer most.

Certainly, public broadcasting has proven itself as a national asset supporting television and radio stations in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

Last year, CPB funded 351 public television stations and 629 public radio stations. Each week NPR touches the lives of 16 million listeners and more than 100 million viewers tune in to PBS weekly.

The numbers show that CPB is a Government program that works, and serves the people of this country. It is one program where the American taxpayer is actually seeing a return on their dollar.

But is CPB a luxury? In these days of deficit reduction, can we afford this service? In thinking about this question, I have reflected back on my role as a mother and teacher.

I am not independently wealthy and have been faced with balancing a checkbook my entire life. When times are tough, everyone suffers, but never have I sacrificed the education of my children.

All parents worry about the uncertain future of their sons or daughters. Frankly, that is why I am so committed to continued funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Education is at the heart of what public broadcasting does. CPB reaches almost every home, school, and business in America to make important learning resources available.

CPB is dedicated to helping and inspiring learners of all ages, in schools, at colleges and universities, at work, and at home.

Public broadcasting is not subsidized television but rather accessible education. More than three-quarters of the country's public television stations offer for-credit adult courses at various levels.

Since 1981, 2.8 million people have taken public broadcasting telecourses for college credit. Over 29 million students in over 70,000 schools receive public TV as an educational resource. Of the top 10 television programs used by teachers in the classroom, 6 are from public TV.

Sure, some may classify public broadcasting as entertainment. I even admit that I became absorbed in "The Civil War" and rushed home to catch "Baseball." But therein lies the secret of public broadcasting. Its ability to education while holding our attention.

From "The Electric Company" to "MacNeil-Lehrer," from "Carmen Sandiego" to "Great Performances," CPB has captivated audiences and provided an educational alternative to network television.

Children today need the same educational stimulation my children had access to, if not more so. Changing family structures and working parents mean more and more children are left home alone. These are the children dependent upon "Sesame Street" and "Barney" for guidance, education and solace. If there is no one at home to pull the kids away from the set, or to choose programming, can't the Government at least provide an accessible alternative which stimulates learning?

The average public television station airs more than 5 hours of quality, non-commercial children's programming every single day and 22.4 million children watch public television each week. The futures of these children can be dramatically shaped by the programs they watch each day.

Remember that 1 year of programming from PBS and NPR, costs each U.S. citizen just \$1.09. Less than a penny a day. In fact, CPB's entire annual budget equals what the networks

make in just 15 minutes of Super Bowl commercials.

More than 95 percent of CPB funds go back to communities nationwide as support for their broadcast operations. More importantly, for every \$1 of Federal funding directed through CPB, stations raise more than \$6 from other sources.

I urge my colleagues on their next visit home to tune in a publicly supported station within their State. Radio stations such as KPBX in Spokane and KFAE in Richland and television stations like KCTS in Seattle and KYVE in Yakima will prove to you how far a minimal Federal investment can be stretched.

Mr. President, the question here is should there be public television. My answer is a solid, loud yes.

Just as we have public schools, public libraries, public roads, and public parks, we should have public television.

"Public" means we, you, and I, own it. We have a say. We have input. We have access.

To only have private television means that those who can afford to own the airwaves will decide what we watch and who can watch. Someone else, someone with the wealth to afford it, will decide what opinions will be aired and whose words will be heard.

I believe it is imperative that the public have access and input to the airwaves.

Let us not be the Congress that is known as the one who took the public out of television.

Let this Congress be remembered for turning the tide on the deficit, but let us do so without sacrificing our children, their education and their future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

THE FOURTH ANNUAL FIREFIGHTERS CHALLENGE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as a longtime supporter of our Nation's firefighters, I am honored to sponsor this resolution that will allow the Congressional Fire Service Institute to hold its Fourth Annual Firefighters Challenge on April 26, 1994, in the park across from the Russell Senate Office Building.

Widely regarded as the most exciting firefighting competition in the Nation, firefighters from as far away as California, Florida, and Ontario, Canada, are scheduled to compete in an event that demonstrates the level of fitness and conditioning essential for today's fire service.

Twenty-four hours a day, 365 days a year, firefighters are on stand by—ready to come to our aid. These well-trained men and women are our first line of defense against fires and a host of other natural disasters. It is my

hope that this site will provide an excellent opportunity for the general public and congressional staff to learn more about firefighting and gain a better understanding of the rigors these genuine heroes face.

Mr. President, I hope we might be able to clear this, either during the wrap-up tonight or tomorrow—at least sometime this week. I will not introduce the resolution at this time until we have had it cleared on both sides of the aisle.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me say for the information of our colleagues, I have been talking with Senator DASCHLE, the Democratic leader, to see if there is some agreement we can reach on this supplemental appropriation bill. Right now I understand on that side of the aisle there are at least 70 amendments and on this side 27. That is almost 100 amendments. If we are to complete action on the bill and go to conference yet this week, today is Monday, we do not have a great deal of time. It was our hope to be in recess on Friday. I think the House also hopes to go out on Friday.

So, I have been talking with the White House. If they do not want to finish this bill, then they ought to let us know, because we may not want to finish the Defense supplemental. We are prepared to make the readiness argument with this President any time he wishes on why we need the supplemental appropriations. The President sent me a letter. I think I received it Saturday morning, and I responded Saturday afternoon to the President's letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent those two letters be printed in the RECORD at this point just so we would have a record made.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORT-AU-PRINCE, March 31, 1995.

Hon. ROBERT DOLE,
Republican Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I am writing to urge you to take prompt action on the supplemental appropriations bill for the Department of Defense. I know that you and all Members of Congress have been working at a heavy pace the past three months and that you have many issues on your agenda. But I know you share the view that it is extremely important that the defense supplemental be addressed before Congress adjourns next Friday.

Both the House and Senate have passed defense supplemental appropriations to pay for ongoing contingency operations. I applaud those actions and agree with the Senate's decision to meet our full commitment to Jordan, in furtherance of the Middle East peace process, in this legislation. Unfortunately, these matters seem tied up in the Conference, and a deadline is looming that requires immediate congressional action to recognize the emergency nature of this supplemental bill and minimize offsetting reductions.

Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili have repeatedly told me and have reported to

Congress that unless supplemental funds were appropriated by March 31, the readiness of our Armed Forces would be adversely affected. That deadline has not been met. As you know, Secretary Perry has told Congress that he will be forced to take specific actions that will impair the readiness of our forces if Congress fails to act by April 7. I realize the respective committees are meeting and are making some progress, but the Conference is still not resolved and time is very short.

I am also concerned about reports that the emergency defense supplemental may be combined with rescission legislation now pending before you. I know you will not permit the Congress to hold the readiness of our Armed Forces hostage to other debates. It is imperative that the Congress approve the supplemental before you adjourn for the Easter/Passover recess.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, DC, April 1, 1995.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, many of my colleagues in the Congress have long voiced concerns about the declining readiness of our Armed Forces and its impact on the brave men and women who so proudly serve. We have warned that the severe defense cuts imposed by your Administration compounded by costly "peacekeeping" operations, neither authorized nor approved by Congress, will drain the readiness accounts and strain our military preparedness. Indeed, these pressures have already manifested themselves in unacceptable readiness ratings for three Army divisions as early as last November. Further, I remind you that several of my colleagues began exhorting Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili to send us their defense request as early as possible, but for some unexplained reason your Administration delayed that action until mid February with the submission of your budget. Our continued warnings have consistently fallen on deaf ears. Now that a severe readiness crisis is upon us, I am hard pressed to see this as the fault of the Congress. Your decision to blame the Congress for any delays and the impending readiness crisis is unfortunate.

Although we have been hampered by a laundry list of amendments offered by members of your party, the House and Senate have taken quick action on your defense supplemental request. The delay in submission coupled with Congressional desires to pay for these costs rather than add them to the debt has made our job more difficult. However, as you point out, we are now in conference and I am hopeful to bring final action before the Easter/Passover recess. As to whether the Congress will choose to combine your defense supplemental and your domestic supplemental request will be a matter that we will decide early next week. The readiness of our Armed Forces is important to all of us as is reducing the deficit, responding to emergency needs in California, and supporting the peace process in the Middle East. Your leadership on these matters would be useful in helping to limit the number of extraneous amendments offered and in bringing all of these issues to an early and acceptable conclusion.

Sincerely,

BOB DOLE.

Mr. DOLE. It may be that the White House has no interest in the pending supplemental legislation. If they do not, I do not know why we are here,

why we are going to debate 97 amendments so certain people can score political points. On every amendment offered on that side from now on there will be a second-degree amendment. It seems to me that is about the only way to make certain both sides are protected here. Because we have had all this talk about how the Democrats are so concerned about children and we do not care about children, we are not sensitive to children. I wonder where they were on the balanced budget amendment when we asked just one more Democrat to vote for a balanced budget amendment so we might protect our children over the next 5, 10, 15, 25 years, but we did not have any response to the argument then.

So now we are seeing efforts to put a little back here and a little here, even though there are increases in all these programs, so the liberal press will write the right spin on the story that the Democrats are protecting children and, of course, we are depriving children of food and medication and about anything else you could believe. I am certain the liberal press will put that spin on it, as it always has in the past.

So it is my view there should not be anything else happening on the bill unless there is going to be debate on the primary amendment from that side, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE, and the amendment offered by this side, by the Senator from Missouri, Senator ASHCROFT, and others.

I am prepared to get consent that we have the debate, time divided equally between now and 6 o'clock. Then at 6:15 we debate whether or not elephants can come to the Capitol. We may have to take a rollcall vote. But that will be 1 hour of debate, and the vote—we have not determined yet, hopefully it will not come until tomorrow morning.

I know the Senator from Massachusetts was here on Friday. He is here again today. He wants to offer his amendment even though I do not think it is necessary. I think we are all for the amendment.

But if it is offered, it probably will be second-degreed and then we will be right back in the same predicament we are in now. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will let me and the Democratic leader try to work out some agreement where the Senator from Massachusetts would be permitted to offer the amendment. I do not have any problem with that. In fact, I support the amendment. So I do not want to be misunderstood.

Is there any way we could accommodate the Senator from Massachusetts and not offer the amendment today but let us proceed on the debate so at least we could have the debate? We are now working with the White House, with the Democratic leader, with our office

to see—if we cannot get any agreement, then none of the amendments will pass in any event.

So I hope we could be permitted to have general debate equally divided between now and 6:15, by sponsoring of the two major amendments. And then at 6:15, the Senator from New Hampshire, Senator SMITH, will be recognized to offer his amendment on House Concurrent Resolution 34.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOLE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I say to the majority leader that I know the majority leader had said on Thursday evening that he was hopeful the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota would be up and he thought at that time it might have been disposed of on Friday. There was certainly no objection from me on that. I thought that was probably going to be the case. Now the Senator has pointed out that we have both the Daschle and the Dole amendments before the Senate.

I have indicated that I was quite prepared to just send my amendment to the desk, have it printed, and after we had disposed of the principal amendments of Senator DOLE and Senator DASCHLE, I would hope that we would be able to consider my amendment. But I would obviously respond to the request of the joint leadership in terms of working out an appropriate time. I am more than glad to do this, recognizing that we have a great deal of business before the Senate prior to the recess.

Mr. DOLE. If the Senator will yield, I understand the Senator will have it printed today but it will not be offered today.

Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. I have talked on it quite a bit, Mr. President. I am not sure that I really have to take any more time on it. I would be glad to send the resolution to the desk. Obviously, it would be a matter before the Senate. I would like to get it printed. I would send it to the desk and have it printed, and then I would be glad to work out with the majority leader and the minority leader the time when we could consider it. I am more than glad to accommodate. If we wanted to do it at the conclusion of the other two amendments, that would be fine.

I can assure the leader that I do not think it will take any more than 5 or 10 minutes equally divided to dispose of it. I will be glad to give an assurance to the leader and to Senator DASCHLE that we would not consider it until after the disposition of at least the two current amendments. They really are the heart and the thrust of the issue here, and they are our first priority. I think they are enormously important, and we ought to consider them.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further? The Democratic leader indicated to me that he was prepared to vote on the D'Amato amendment, which indicates that he must

have the votes to table. Would there be any objection to having it follow the vote on the D'Amato amendment, because his amendment was pending prior?

Mr. KENNEDY. I understand from the floor staff that Senator Daschle has indicated willingness to go to the vote on D'Amato tomorrow, and it is entirely acceptable to me to vote right after the D'Amato amendment on this amendment, if that is agreeable.

Mr. DOLE. The caveat, Mr. President, would be if we decided to pull the bill down because there are so many amendments. I do not want anybody to be blindsided. But it could happen, with 97 amendments, which would take quite a while, that we might just pull the bill down until after the recess. As long as the Senator understood that, I think we have an agreement. He could send it to the desk now, and have it printed with an understanding that following the vote on the D'Amato amendment, disposition of the D'Amato amendment, the Senator be recognized for a vote on his amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD for the information of Senators.

It is my understanding that we will have the vote on the D'Amato amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the appropriate place in the amendment, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX AVOIDANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should act as quickly as possible to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to eliminate the ability of persons to avoid taxes by relinquishing their United States citizenship.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is satisfactory.

Mr. DOLE. As I said, the only exception would occur—

Mr. KENNEDY. I understand what the Senator said. It could be withdrawn.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I think there is a serious effort by the Democratic and Republican leaders and the White House to try to see if we can bring this to closure. If we cannot, we will pull the bill down. If we can, we will try to finish it tomorrow evening. There is no way we can finish it with 97 amendments. That would take the rest of this week and all of next week, and I have something else planned for next week. In any event, many other Senators have plans for next week.

I wonder if it would be all right, between now and 6:15, the time equally divided.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—this has been cleared by the Democratic leader—that all time between now and 6:15 p.m. be equally divided between the Democratic leader and Senator ASHCROFT, or their des-

igneers, for debate on the Daschle and Dole amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. I further ask unanimous consent that at 6:15, whenever the Senator from New Hampshire is available, during that timeframe, that we proceed to House Concurrent Resolution 34, and that Senator SMITH be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Morning business has expired.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I would like to speak to the proposal that is before the Senate, and specifically I want to refer to a Reuter's news account that was issued this morning. I am going to read from the account. It says:

This administration believes a strong dollar is in America's interest, and we remain committed to strengthening the economic fundamentals that are ultimately important to maintaining a strong and stable currency.

That quote, Mr. President, is from our Treasury Secretary, Robert Rubin. The story goes on, however, and says that the currency market did not pay any attention to our Secretary of the Treasury driving the dollar down to yet another record low against the Japanese yen. Since the start of the year, the dollar has plunged more than 13 percent against the yen.

The story goes on and says that America's bulging budget—bulging budget—and trade deficits to its shrinking savings rate is driving the currency lower, and Washington—that is us—seems unable or unwilling to do anything about it.

Mr. President, Chairman Greenspan recently called the falling dollar “unwelcome and troublesome.” He said just recently that “Foreign markets were increasingly distressed about the huge amounts of Washington borrowing to pay for deficit spending.”

The central bank chief—that is, Alan Greenspan—also linked last week's projection—now 2 weeks ago—of the balanced budget amendment by the Senate with the latest troubles facing our dollar.

The Secretary of the Treasury has gone before the world to try to strengthen the dollar, and the world did not pay any attention. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve said our dollar has suffered from the failure to pass the balanced budget amendment and it is destabilizing our currency.

In deference to time, Mr. President, I am not going to read from the seven different economists who are defining the problem with our currency as being directly related, as the Reuter's story acknowledged, to our budget deficits; more importantly, to our unwillingness to do anything about it, to the defeat of the balanced budget amendment and to spiraling trade deficits.

Last week, in front of Emory University students in Atlanta, my home city and State, the President and this same Secretary tried to tell those students and America that we really are operating an operational surplus. I said at the time that was not factual and, more important, it was harmful because by telling the Nation we have an operational surplus, you are sapping the will of this country to do the things it needs to do.

Mr. President, in light of these reports about the falling dollar today, I would like to call on the President of the United States to change his mind and call on the Congress to pass a balanced budget amendment. That is one of the strongest actions; these statements before the world are not having an effect. The world saw us defeat the balanced budget amendment. The world saw the President's budgets with \$200 billion deficits as far as the eye can see. The world is watching us argue about these minimal cuts right here today. Mr. President, the President should call on the six Senators on the other side of the aisle that voted for a balanced budget amendment 1 year ago who changed their mind this year, who participated in what is now happening to our currency worldwide. And the best short-term signal we could send to this world about our currency is that we are going to stand up and pass a balanced budget amendment and send it to the States for ratification.

The Senators from New Mexico, North Dakota, California, Kentucky, and South Carolina decided to vote against it this year. They voted for it last year. The President said he was for a balanced budget "but." And I would suggest to you, Mr. President, that the world has taken more notice of the word "but" than any of the other things that are emanating from the administration such as we really have an operational surplus.

For Heaven sakes. By the way, the reason they calculated that was they said you would not have to add in our interest on debt and then we would have a surplus.

I was speaking to a group of business people today, and I said:

You remember when you went before the loan officer and the loan officer said, "I am sorry; I can't loan you any more money because of your financial statement." And you turned to the loan officer and said, "Well, if you just forget the interest payments I am making to you, I would have a great financial statement." You know what the reaction of that loan officer would be.

Mr. President, the world has taken note of the, "I'm for a balanced budget but I am going to oppose a balanced budget amendment. I am going to submit budgets to the Congress and to the people with huge and unending deficits." And the quickest way we could turn this around would be for the President to call the leaders of this Senate and say, "Pass it."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I would like to get back to what I believe is the business before us. Are we on the Daschle amendment as amended by the Dole amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair. It seems as if we have been at this for some time, and we have had some very enlightening discussions in other areas, but this bill, which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota seeks to amend, is an extremely important one. I spent some time last week presenting the details of this measure and talking about reasons why it was necessary for us to rescind budget authority and outlays for the coming year. Having made those points, I do not want to make them again. I wish to instead focus on some of the basic underlying assumptions in the Daschle amendment.

You will recall that this bill as we reported it out of the Appropriations Committee provides in the current year and next year about \$6.7 billion for the California disaster relief effort. The Daschle amendment cuts \$1.3 billion out of that.

Mr. President, I would have to say what a difference a week makes, because last week we heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that what we needed was an across-the-board cut in all Federal agencies as an emergency step in order to pay for the terrible natural disasters which have afflicted the country this past year. In particular, we heard a very compelling argument from the Senator from California about the tragedies in her State and the need to provide the money so that the residents of California would get their lives and communities back together. Thus, they offered an amendment to provide \$6.7 billion in disaster funding and cut elsewhere across the board.

Today, it appears maybe they do not need all that money. Today, just a few days later, the terrible California disaster described so eloquently is not going to require the \$6.7 billion it did

last week. Now they only require \$5.4 billion. Never have I seen \$1 billion saved quite so quickly.

I had to ask myself why. Well, I soon discovered it is not that they really want to save that money. Instead they want to spend it on some of their and the President's favorite programs. Today, instead of setting the money aside to help disaster victims, they want to raid a rainy day fund and spend it on so-called volunteers or throw more money at HUD, an agency in the midst of its own financial and management disaster. It is no wonder that many of my colleagues agree with the Congressional Budget Office's analysis of what happens when a rainy day fund for disasters is set up. I believe we ought to set money aside, but there are some questions I have about setting it up.

Let me quote from the disaster task force report which was issued only 3 weeks ago. I had the pleasure of serving with the distinguished Senator, Mr. GLENN, from Ohio as co-chair of that disaster task force. We brought together all of the information on disasters and asked the agencies—CBO, GAO, CRS—about what we might do. In that disaster task force report prepared by the agencies there was a very prophetic statement. Our report said:

A tendency to spend accumulated funds might be a problem unless the law restricted the types of disasters that would qualify. Policymakers could become tempted to be more generous in relieving small disasters or to raid the fund for spending in other programs.

Well, Mr. President, that kind of looks to me like what we had. Only 3 weeks from the report and days from the discussion of the rainy day fund the first raid is being attempted on disaster relief.

So let me tell my colleagues, if this is what we can expect, regular, systematic raids on the disaster relief fund to pay for political goals, then I for one, this Senator, is not going to support any sort of rainy day fund.

What kind of discipline does this show to the American people, that just days after arguing for a \$6.7 billion rainy day disaster fund, the same people now want to raid the fund for other purposes? How many families set aside funds for emergencies and then successfully resist the temptation to raid them? How many communities and small businesses set aside funds and then successfully resist the temptation to just dip in a little more for some reason? But not our colleagues here today. They view the disaster relief fund as a honey pot which lets them avoid tough choices of where else to cut in order to spend more on the programs they like.

Instead of standing up and saying, "We don't like your proposed spending cuts; here are ours to replace them," our friends on the other side of the

aisle, once again show their colors on spending cuts. They say, "We want to spend first and worry about the deficit and the debt later on".

Again, I go back to the prophetic words of the disaster relief task force. In that report the agency said:

Requiring the Congress to cut spending and other programs would raise the political cost of providing disaster relief. Now, increases in disaster relief increase the budget deficit, which may impede economic growth over the long term. But the effects on the standard of living of future generations have far less direct influence on political decisions than having to cut programs this year or next year.

No wonder our debt is nearly \$5 trillion. No wonder the President's budget thought it would be OK to leave the deficit at \$200 billion a year for the next 5 years, adding another \$1 trillion to our national debt. This is a debt, Mr. President, that threatens our economic stability.

Our distinguished colleague from Georgia has already spoken about what judgment the international financial markets are passing on the value of the dollar. And it is because we just do not seem to be too concerned about adding another little \$1 trillion to our national debt.

Well, Mr. President, I think it is very serious for our economy and it is very serious for our children and grandchildren who are going to be carrying the burden of that debt on their credit card.

Let me speak about one particular aspect of the Daschle amendment. I want to focus on that for, I hope, the enlightenment, perhaps, of my colleagues. But maybe they all know it.

I want to focus on the proposal to restore national service funding. I believe this issue highlights the fundamental differences between those who would shrink Government and those who still believe in business as usual.

The bill before us proposed a cut of \$210 million to bring AmeriCorps and other new programs authorized by the 1993 National and Community Service Act back to the fiscal year 1994 level. The fiscal year 1995 appropriation for this year was \$575 million; the rescission currently in the bill would bring that funding level back to \$365 million. The National Service Corporation had hoped to have 33,000 volunteers enrolled by the end of fiscal year 1995. The bill before us, as reported out of committee, would keep the number of volunteers—and I say "volunteers" in quotes—at about 20,000. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Daschle amendment for the additional reason because I do not believe the increase in funds for AmeriCorps is justified.

The cut we have proposed is legitimate. We are not gutting the program, as some have suggested. The corporation actually received a huge increase for the current fiscal year over the fiscal year 1994 level. They had \$365 million in fiscal year 1994 for AmeriCorps grants, education awards, technical assistance, and related activities. They

received \$575 million in last year's appropriation for the current fiscal year. That is a 58-percent increase for an untested program. I have not seen any increase of that level in any other discretionary program. At a time when we are running budget deficits of hundreds of billions of dollars each year on top of a debt load of \$4.8 trillion, we just cannot afford the increase.

This rescission will not affect any programs now in operation. The fiscal year 1995 funds are not scheduled to be spent until the start of the school year in September 1995. So we will not have to stop work that is now going on. We are simply proposing that the amount available to the programs scheduled to begin this fall be the same as for those that began last fall.

Under the Senate bill, none of the volunteers—or, actually, employees—currently serving will be affected. The program would remain at the same level. The corporation could still increase the number of those it hires and chooses to fund in State and local programs next year by reallocating the money provided.

For instance, the corporation is now spending \$32 million on innovation, demonstration and assistance activities, which includes training and technical assistance for AmeriCorps programs. Presumably, most not-for-profits that receive funds are already experienced themselves in training new employees and providing services. And many of them are working with true volunteers.

The corporation also spent \$3 million this year on planning grants. Now, those do not fund a single new position, but simply allow an organization to plan how they will use volunteers in the future. And, both the National Service Corporation and the State commissions spend a good deal of money on public relations and recruitment of volunteers—read "employees." I would argue that we can do less of that since the program is now well established, if it is continued, and it is well known.

In addition, the corporation awarded more than \$14 million to Federal agencies this year, nearly 10 percent of the total amount available for AmeriCorps grants. Why are we padding the Federal payroll with paid, they call them, volunteers—I call them employees—at the same time the administration claims it is downsizing the civil service?

We cut it on one hand, but we call them volunteers and we spend \$14 million hiring them on the other hand. I think there is a good deal of room to make cuts in these areas if the corporation wants to increase the number of those serving in State and local programs, under the bill.

I remain a great skeptic of the program. I am looking forward to conducting oversight hearings, which we will have in our subcommittee during the next few months, to determine exactly where our money is going. And,

in particular, I am concerned about the money going to AmeriCorps national direct programs.

Under the act, in 1993, there are three different ways that you can receive funds. One-third of the funds are available to States according to a population-based formula. The States then choose which programs receive funds. Another third of the funds are distributed to programs that are first selected by the States and then submitted to the corporation for competitive consideration. The final third of the funds for AmeriCorps are distributed directly to the National Service Corporation to programs operated by national non-profit organizations, programs operating in more than one State, and to Federal agencies. I would like to focus the attention of my colleagues on some of these programs.

I think America would be surprised to learn where fully one-third of the funds for AmeriCorps is actually going. I venture to guess that most Americans believe that money in this pot is going to help support the efforts of some well-established, reputable, mainstream volunteer organizations that we have all come to know and rely on. We would expect, Mr. President, the funding would go to the Red Cross, the Girl Scouts, Boys and Girls Clubs, Big Brothers and Big Sisters, and the 4-H; that they would be the ones receiving funds from that source. That certainly was my expectation.

Needless to say, I was surprised to learn that is not where the money is going. So I asked, and the Corporation for National Service provided me, with a list of all applicants in the "National Direct" program for 1994, as well as a list of those groups that receive funding.

I have made a chart of some of the examples that we have found. I think they will be illustrative.

All of these groups applied for "AmeriCorps Direct" awards for fiscal year 1994, as well as many other groups. This is not the exclusive list.

Here is the list of who was funded and this is a partial list of those who were not funded. Many well-established, reputable, and noncontroversial voluntary organizations did not receive funds. But look at the list of those who did receive funds, in addition to those that are Federal agencies. Can you say "politically correct"?

Take a look at what we funded. This was our volunteer money. We are downsizing the civil service, cutting the Federal Government, getting rid of employees.

So why is the money going to hire people in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, the Department of Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Veterans Affairs?

Sounds like a good way to cut the civil service. If you get a program, call it a "volunteer" program and use it to fund these.

And then there are others, ACORN Housing, Legal Services Corporation, National Endowment for the Arts, National Community AIDS Partnership.

These are the programs being funded by the AmeriCorps direct funding program.

These are some of the ones that are not funded, and somehow it strikes me as passing curious that they chose not to fund the Future Farmers of America, the National 4-H Council, the Girl Scouts of America, the American Red Cross, Big Brother/Big Sisters, Boys and Girls Clubs, National Audubon Society, Appalachian Mountain Club, American Library Association, United Negro College Fund, United Way of America, and United Cerebral Palsy Association.

I have had an opportunity to work with many of these fine organizations, and when you are talking about volunteers, this is where I think you need support, if you need support, to get people who are actually doing volunteer work.

Mr. SANTORUM. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOND. Yes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Are those not funded? Did they apply for grants and were refused?

Mr. BOND. These are agencies all of which applied. "Funded" are the ones which were funded by the AmeriCorps direct program. The ones "Not Funded" are the ones I just read, beginning with the Future Farmers of America.

Mr. SANTORUM. That is amazing.

Mr. BOND. That is exactly my point. I do not believe that the priorities chosen by the National Service Corps are the priorities of the American people. Americans do choose where they give their time voluntarily. We know where people want to give and work as volunteers. Over 80 million Americans choose to donate unpaid time to charitable volunteer work each week and they choose their churches, their schools, their hospitals, the Red Cross, the Girl Scouts, the Big Brother/Big Sisters. They do not choose to donate their time to the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Transportation, or the Department of Labor.

I think the American people might well be shocked to learn that these Federal agencies were chosen over other well-known, well-established and much respected volunteer organizations which were turned down.

I am sure that if you go back to the State programs, my colleagues will undoubtedly show me examples of Girl Scouts and Red Cross programs funded through the State commissions, one of two sources of funding, but that is not the area of national priorities. The corporation has clearly chosen not to fund those groups. The further away from States and local communities where

the volunteer work is actually being done, where people volunteer their time and their resources, that the decisionmaking occurs, that is where decisions to fund the Federal Departments and those agencies which carry out the politically correct goals happen.

I suggest that the funding decisions of the national corporation may not reflect the priorities of American people. I have not examined the decision of the State commissions sufficiently to be able to comment on those. We will explore those in the VA, HUD Appropriations Subcommittee during our fiscal 1996 oversight hearings.

But for the purposes of the discussion of the Daschle amendment, I absolutely do not believe we should restore funding for the Corporation for National Service. In fact, considering some of the other tough decisions we have made, there is room for further cuts. We are only bringing the program back to the 1994 level. Based on what I described, I believe that is overly generous.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to turn down the Daschle amendment. The Daschle amendment has one provision which has been called to our attention by Senator INOUE, the problem with funding for Indian housing. I have been working with Senator INOUE and his staff. I believe we can accommodate the needs of Senator INOUE for the Indian housing.

I think we need to take special recognition of the problems which may arise there at a later time in the discussion of this bill when we have an amendment, however we work it out with Senator INOUE, who has been a leader on this, and Senator MCCAIN.

We will attempt to work out a good compromise to make sure that the cuts do not fall unnecessarily heavily on our native Americans. I will discuss the particular needs of that program. That, too, is included in the Daschle amendment.

But the main point of the Daschle amendment is to cut \$1.3 billion from what was described last week by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as "critically needed, vitally important, let's-do-it-now emergency relief" so we can go back and spend money on HUD, which is already spending too much money, on the National Service Corporation, the AmeriCorps direct dollars, which are keeping all those wonderful people employed at Federal agencies.

Mr. President, I just do not believe we need to restore those cuts. So I urge my colleagues not to accept the Daschle amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I want to commend the senior Senator from Missouri for an outstanding presentation. The juxtaposition of the funded agencies and the volunteer

agencies is a stark and compelling contrast. To think that the Future Farmers of America applied and were turned down when the Department of Agriculture was funded; to think that the 4-H Council applied and was turned down while the Department of Energy was funded; to think that the Departments of Interior, Justice, and Labor were successful applicants when no "volunteers" were provided to the Girl Scouts or the American Red Cross. In my mind, and I think my good friend would agree, this reflects very poorly on the character and quality of the AmeriCorp Program.

Mr. President, we are not talking about rescinding Federal money in a vacuum. I believe this entire debate must be placed in the context of America's financial condition. The American people are alarmed at a \$4.8 trillion debt. Last November, they said "It is time to stop this out of control spending, and put our fiscal house in order."

In family budgeting, what father or mother would say, "Even though we are \$72,000 in debt, business as usual will suffice." Despite our massive debt and rising deficits, Bill Clinton has suggested just that. The President has projected \$200-billion-a-year deficits for as far as the eye can see. Mr. President, this type of unrestrained spending must stop.

So, I rise today in support of the majority leader's amendment. If enacted, this package would significantly decrease discretionary spending for this fiscal year. More importantly, it would achieve that end by attacking non-essential government services. AmeriCorp, which I discussed earlier, is a perfect example. This so-called volunteer program, which costs \$30,400 per participant per year, is not a volunteer program at all. It is a way of paying individuals to do things that people already do.

Mr. President, out of the \$30,000 used to support each volunteer in this program, \$15,000 goes to administration and overhead costs. That means that this is really just a program to support the Federal bureaucracy. Then, when you think of the rest of the money—the \$15,400 that is left over for the volunteer after you have paid the \$15,000 for overhead and costs—you have to understand that 20 percent of all of those volunteers are working in the Departments of Agriculture, Energy, Labor, the Environmental Protection Agency, or the National Endowment for the Arts.

AmeriCorps. It sounds like you ought to stand up and salute. The truth is that the American people ought to stand up and grab their wallets because it represents a raid on their resources. And not just the American people, but also the yet unearned wages of generations to come.

Mr. President, we hear over and over again from the Democrat party that we have to save the children. Well, let us save them from bankruptcy. Let us practice a little responsibility. The

Senator from California earlier today said, "Say goodbye to Big Bird," as if we were to curtail funding for public broadcasting there wouldn't be any worthwhile children's programming. This is nonsense and the American people know it. In fact, a recent Lou Harris poll found that public broadcasting is third on a list of Federal programs that should be abolished.

Only \$7.5 million of the \$300 million spent on PBS goes directly to children's programming. Where does the money go? It goes to purchase and develop programming for wealthy adults. According to one of its own member stations, WMET, "one out of eight contributors to PBS is a millionaire. One out of seven has a wine cellar, and one out of every three has spent time in Europe in the last three years." This is not a social welfare program, it is welfare for the rich. Mr. President, these are the types of people taking advantage of PBS, and taking advantage of the American taxpayer. As my friend Senator PRESSLER noted, the wealthy donors to public broadcasting could easily make up the 14 percent of Federal funding that CPB receives if they simply gave an additional \$55 a year.

Mr. President, I believe we also need to look carefully at the foreign operations budget. The House suggested rescinding \$191.6 million. The Senate cut only \$100 million. Well, I think we ought to be rescinding what the House proposed. The additional \$91.6 million would bring our total Federal foreign operations reduction to 1.4 percent. If we are serious about balancing the budget, and if we really care about kids, we must at the very minimum do that.

So, we have an opportunity to say to the American people that we heard the message of November 8. We understand that it is important for us to make serious cuts. The Senate has a \$13 billion rescission package. The House was at \$17 billion. Thus, we can add the \$1.3 billion in this amendment and still not make it to the House level.

Mr. President, during the debate on the balanced budget amendment, member after member who opposed the bill talked about making tough choices. Furthermore, they all indicated that they were ready to move toward a balanced budget. Let me suggest that now is the time to begin. It is time because that is what the American people sent us here to do. Unfortunately, the President continues to take us down a different road, a road of increased deficits and debt. Let this Chamber be different. Let this Chamber fundamentally alter the way Washington works. We should rescind the funds which were proposed by the committee and add to it what the majority leader has suggested. If we do, we will begin to demonstrate responsibility, and that brings me to my last point.

I think what Government does is teaches. We all talk about the value of education. The most important lesson we can learn is the lesson of responsi-

bility. Are we or are we not people who pay our bills? Do we live with the consequences of the decisions we make? Are we willing to accept responsibility for what we do? If our citizens make that kind of commitment, the coming era can once again be called the American century. Regrettably, as a Government, we have yet to make that commitment. Some of us are concerned that as citizens we have not made that kind of commitment either. Maybe our Government is not teaching responsibility the way it ought to. Maybe our example speaks so loudly to young people that they believe they are not responsible for the actions that they take. After all, when we continue to appropriate and spend, when we continue to obfuscate and mislabel, government fails in its obligation to the citizenry.

Mr. President, let us instruct the young people of this Nation properly. Let us show them that we have the willingness to exercise the discipline necessary to succeed in balancing the budget. In my mind, this means not only having a rescission bill, but also supporting the majority leader's amendment. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will do just that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment by Senator DASCHLE, and I am doing so primarily because of my belief that we should not make as drastic cuts in the education accounts as the majority leader would have the Senate make.

Let me put this in context, Mr. President. I know there is a lot of talk about, are you in favor of deficit reduction, or are you not in favor of deficit reduction? I honestly believe that all Members are in favor of deficit reduction here in the Senate. We want to find an appropriate way to accomplish that.

In my opinion, the test of whether we are serious about deficit reduction will come in two areas. First, our willingness to curtail spending in a whole range of areas—not just the areas being addressed by this bill, but all areas—defense, intelligence, community funding, agricultural subsidy funding, foreign aid funding, as well as the domestic accounts. Entitlements are a key part, when we are serious about constraining spending.

The second area in the test of whether we are serious is whether or not we will reject the siren call to cut taxes. There is a major effort, on the other side of the Hill this week to try to go ahead and cut everybody's taxes, particularly the taxes of the wealthy. In my view, that is not a responsible action if we are serious about deficit reduction. It does not make any sense to give speech after speech after speech here in the Congress about our concern about the deficit and then turn around and cut taxes and reduce the revenue

that the Government is receiving to keep that deficit from escalating. Those are the real issues.

Now I want to talk for a few moments about the impact of the proposed rescissions on education, because I believe very strongly that not only should we try to maintain funding in education but wherever possible we should try to increase funding.

As I travel around my State, Mr. President, and ask people in town hall meetings, "What percentage of the Federal budget do you believe is committed to improving education?" Some say maybe 5 percent, others say, maybe 10 percent, and we get into discussions over how much money is spent on education. I respond, "Let me tell you, it is 1.7 percent of the Federal budget that is committed to improving education in this country."

That is a figure which is down substantially from what it was a decade ago. In 1985 we committed 2.5 percent of our Federal outlays to improving education. This last year, it was 1.7 percent.

Mr. President, education is not the cause of our large Federal deficit. It has been taking its share of cuts all along and, in fact, even if the amendment of Senator DASCHLE is approved, there will be substantial cuts in education as part of this rescission bill. We are willing to accept that.

There are 19 different programs that the Department of Education operates dealing with education. The proposed amendment of Senator DASCHLE would try to restore funding to the level we appropriated and authorized last year in 7 of the 19—not in all of them—but in 7 of the 19.

Programs such as the title I grants which go to schools with disadvantaged children; the school-to-work opportunities, which help students to transition from school into employment; the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program; and the Immigrant Education Program, aimed at those people who are legally here in the United States legally working with green cards and their children need to be educated.

The Head Start Program. Mr. President, there are many students, many children in my State who would like to participate in the Head Start Program. However, there is inadequate funding for them to do that. In most cases, these are children of very low-income families. I think that the Head Start Program is a good investment for our country. I think we can legitimately be for deficit reduction without cutting back on the funding for the Head Start Program.

I want to urge my colleagues to think about priorities as we go about this cutting exercise. It does not do any good to rush ahead with cuts in all areas. The American people want Members of Congress to be very selective in the cuts that we make. The Wall Street Journal and NBC News did a poll recently that said that 79 percent of Americans believe that cutting Federal

spending for education takes this country in the wrong direction.

That is exactly what the majority leader is proposing that we do here today. He is proposing that we go ahead with major cuts in the Federal funds for education. I think it is a shortsighted approach. I think we will at some stage down the road regret our action.

This year, we are spending 1.7 percent of the Federal budget on education. We can continue to ratchet that down. We can get it down to 1 percent. We can get it down below 1 percent and we will still have a very large Federal deficit. Mr. President, we are kidding the American people if we suggest to them that cutting our funds for Head Start is going to solve the deficit problem. It is not going to solve the deficit problem. We need to acknowledge that upfront and go after some of the areas where real money is being spent in our Federal budget. There are many of those areas.

I urge my colleagues to join in some of the other proposals which will undoubtedly be made as we get into consideration of the budget resolution, which involves serious cuts in Federal spending for the future.

Mr. President, it is not as easy as just saying "Cut, cut, cut," regardless of the impact on whoever in our society, and "Cut, cut, cut" regardless of what priority is thrown out the window in the process. We need to be specific about where cuts make sense and where they do not make sense. Clearly we need to find ways to conserve funding and to restrain Federal spending.

I expect by the end of this legislative session, I will have done at least as much as most of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support cuts in funding for a variety of Federal activities.

However, cuts in education at this stage in our Nation's history do not make sense. They are not supported by the American people. Senator DASCHLE tries to restore a few of the funds that are otherwise proposed to be cut. I support him in that effort. I wish we could restore more. However, we are not able to.

Even if the amendment of Senator DASCHLE is adopted, there will be rescissions in virtually all the programs, lesser rescissions than are proposed by the majority leader but rescissions still. There are 12 of the 19 programs that are in the Education Department which will take significant cuts even if the Daschle amendment is adopted.

Mr. President, I will not belabor the point, but I do think the least we can do here in the U.S. Senate this evening is to try to maintain last year's level of funding in some of these key programs that relate to education. That is what Senator DASCHLE's amendment does. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes of the remaining 20

minutes of the majority time to the Senator from Arizona, Senator KYL.

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Let me take a couple moments, first of all, to address some of the comments of my colleague from New Mexico, because I think the debate is fairly framed by some of the things which he had to say. It does demonstrate the difference in approach that we take to this matter of reducing the Federal spending and trying to find ways to rescind spending from last year which is what the Dole amendment is all about.

The Senator from New Mexico makes a primary point that education funding should not be further cut. I would like to make two points with respect to this.

The first is, as far as I am concerned, it is not a matter of cutting spending. It is a question of who does the spending. Our idea here is that the Federal Government should do less of the spending and that the families of America should get to do more of the spending.

As a result, when we talk about a \$500 tax credit for children, for example, what we are saying is, who would you rather have spend the money on your children? The Federal Government or the family who is responsible for their care?

We would rather give the family the \$500 per child and let them decide whether they are going to enroll their child in a special education program, buy a new computer, get some books or in whatever way they feel it best to spend that money for their children's education—to do that, rather than to assume that the Federal Government can put better use to that money than can the families of America. That is the theory for our approach to this question of Federal spending.

Second, to get right to the point of the rescission package that is before us, the Dole amendment, says that we should add about \$1.3 billion in rescissions, in other words in cuts to the package that has been put before the body from the Appropriations Committee. This would conform, or get close to conforming, the Senate package of rescissions with the House package, at roughly \$16 or \$17 billion.

Let us talk about how it might affect education. One of the items we would like to rescind more of the money on is the AmeriCorps Program that the Senator from Missouri was talking about a moment ago. The AmeriCorps program in the House rescinds, or has rescinded in it, about \$416 million to a level of \$158 million, close to \$159 million, for next fiscal year. The Dole amendment would conform the Senate position to the House position. Right now, the Senate position is to only rescind half that money.

How does the AmeriCorps program affect education in our country? Here is one way. The AmeriCorps Program spends as much money on one person, one so-called volunteer—who, of

course, as we know is not a volunteer at all but is paid for work, \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year, \$40,000 in Alaska—as could be spent to fund eight Pell grants for needy students to come to school. As we know, the Pell Grant Program is based on need; it goes to needy students. So we could send eight needy students to college for what we are spending today on one volunteer in the AmeriCorps Program.

This chart makes the point. At this level here, you have the 3.9 million young people in America who are volunteers today, not being paid a penny for their volunteer service, and here you have the maximum of 20,000 young Americans who will participate in the AmeriCorps Program.

What is the cost? Bear in mind, these almost 4 million people get paid nothing. These are the youngsters, the youth of our country, young men and women, teenagers and young people who are doing volunteer work who are between the ages of 16 and 24, as compared to these 20,000. What is it costing? This makes the point about the Pell grants, as I said. Here are the number of people, Pell grant recipients, who could be funded with the money for one AmeriCorps volunteer in the State of Alaska.

Incidentally, we might ask the question, why does it cost over \$40,000 a year for an AmeriCorps volunteer in Alaska, but we will leave that for another day, perhaps.

The point is, with this Alaska volunteer, if we rescinded the money for that AmeriCorps volunteer, we could send over 28 needy young Americans to college next year. That is what education is all about. So when some of our colleagues say we need to pay more attention to education, I say you bet we should, in two respects:

First, we should not waste it on programs that really do not help the needy. We should put it where it does the most good. That means going along with our package of rescissions here with respect to AmeriCorps.

Second, instead of talking about cutting education funding, we ought to talk about who actually does the funding. Who does the spending? It ought to be the families of America, not the U.S. Government.

I was curious about the chart that was behind the Senator from New Mexico, and I gather has been used by some of the Senators on that side of the aisle. The whole point of the chart is who gains and who loses, and that is the way a lot of liberals look at the American Government. It is a zero sum game. We need to take from them so we will have something over here. It is never taught that John F. Kennedy used to engage in trying to expand the pie. Remember what he said, "A rising tide lifts all boats."

His point in saying that, by the way, was we needed to have a capital gains cut for corporations. It does not sound like the Democratic rhetoric that we hear today. But this was a Democrat

President who understood if we are all better off we are all better off, and you cannot be employed if there is no employer, and employers need money to pay for people, to pay for their employees. So he understood that making everybody better off is the name of the game, not arguing over the size of the existing pie.

That is what the chart that the Senator from New Mexico was standing next to basically tries to portray—who gains and who loses.

Our idea is that is the politics of envy. As I said, it is a zero sum game. Our general point should be to reduce Federal spending generally so there is more left over for the American family to spend so there is more left over for savings and for investment, for growth in the American economy so that our children and grandchildren will have a better future.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. KYL. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. This bill cuts \$13 billion from the Federal budget. That is roughly 1 percent.

If we cannot muster the fortitude to take 1 percent out of the budget here and now, what does it say for future deficits?

Mr. KYL. I say to my colleague from North Carolina, that is the same question I had been asking all last week when various people said to me, "My goodness, you are cutting something out of this and cutting something out of that?"

I said, "This is just the beginning. If you do not have the fortitude to do this, how are you ever going to balance the budget?"

By the way, these were the same people who were against the balanced budget amendment on the basis we were elected to make the tough decisions. Looks like they are running for the woods now.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. What it amounts to is not only have we failed to pass the balanced budget amendment, we are here in deep debate over whether we can take 1 percent out of it. We saw, by failure to pass the balanced budget amendment, very clearly that the value of the dollar against every other industrialized currency throughout the world took a deep dive. The Senator from Georgia talked about it earlier. Now we are further reinforcing the idea throughout the financial communities of the world that we do not intend to reduce the budget. We are simply going to talk about it.

Mr. KYL. I think the Senator from North Carolina makes an excellent point there.

Mr. President, might I inquire how much time remains on this side, for the Senator from Missouri?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). Nearly 12 minutes remain.

Mr. KYL. Let me sum up. If the Senator from North Carolina has more to talk about here, that will be fine. Otherwise, let me take a minute to sum up

because I know the Senator from Pennsylvania has something to say about this, as well.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. I thank the Senator for allowing me to ask the question.

Mr. KYL. Let us just sum it up this way, because there are a whole list of programs that are the subject of the rescission in the amendment of the Senator from Kansas, the distinguished majority leader.

The majority leader's amendment—what we will be voting on tomorrow—is to add some rescissions, some additional reductions in spending to programs like AmeriCorps, as we pointed out, foreign operations, the foreign aid program that the Senator from Missouri talked about, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting that the Senator from Pennsylvania has talked about, the Internal Revenue Service—there are a whole variety of them. My colleague from Arizona, JOHN MCCAIN, had suggested about \$337 million in cuts that the President himself requested and that this body has not seen fit to include in its rescissions package.

Let me conclude with this. It is not as if we are trying to do something rather odd here in suggesting a little more in the way of rescissions. On the AmeriCorps Program that we were talking about, what was the vote in the House of Representatives for rescinding twice as much as the Senate is proposing to rescind? Was that a partisan vote? Democrat and Republican? The vote was on March 15, 382 to 23. This is a bipartisan understanding of what we need to do to get our budget deficit under control here. So, by a vote of 382 to 23, the House of Representatives voted to rescind about \$416 million from AmeriCorps.

It seems to me that the Senate could do just as well.

So I hope that our colleagues will support the Dole substitute when it comes to a vote, and I appreciate the Senator from Missouri yielding time.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of the time allotted to the majority leader's amendment to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding. I would like to follow up on what the Senator from Arizona and others have spoken about with respect to this amendment by the Senator from Missouri, both the senior and junior Senators with respect to the AmeriCorps Program.

I would first like to touch on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. We are proposing in this amendment to increase the amount of rescissions—in other words, to reduce the deficit—by an additional \$1.3 billion, restore the California disaster relief funds of \$1.3 billion, and add \$1.3 billion in cuts with the Dole amendment.

The principal area that we are trying to deem the cuts, so to speak—the biggest one—is the President's own rescissions package, which is \$337 million of what he termed pork, special interest demonstration projects put in by Members of Congress, both the House and Senate. They are the President's own rescission. We are saying let us vote on your President's own rescissions, and let us reduce the deficit as he would like to have seen done with these rescissions.

Another big area is the AmeriCorps Program, which is the national service program, which we have heard some talk about, which I will mention briefly.

But the one that I think has gotten a lot of publicity which I think is just an amazing program that gets funded here is the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. This is a very controversial measure. I think I have received more mail on attempts to cut the Corporation for Public Broadcasting than any other single issue that has been before the U.S. Congress.

That is interesting in the sense that it is only \$285 million in the budget. I was reminded by a television station in Pennsylvania, WHYY, that it is only .003 percent of the national budget, so it is not significant. "Why are you picking on us?" I heard the Senator from New Mexico say, "Well, education overall is only 1.7 percent of the budget. Why are you picking on us?" We are not going to balance the budget on education. We are not going to balance the budget on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, nor on AmeriCorps. If you keep going down, do you know what are going to come up with? We will not balance the budget because we will never get any of this stuff. We will never balance the budget.

What is the answer? Let us cut the big programs. OK. Let us all line up here. Everybody who wants to cut Medicare, come on down the aisle. Come on. Come on down the aisle. There is nobody coming down the aisle. Nobody wants to cut Social Security? Come on. It is a big program, \$200 or \$300 billion. Come on down the aisle. Where is everybody? Where is everybody who wants to cut Medicaid? Where is everybody that wants to cut national defense? Where is everybody who wants to cut the big programs? The Government is made up of a few big programs but lots of little programs. A lot of these little programs are very good programs. A lot of them are well-meaning programs. But, frankly, a lot of them need to be pared back or need to be eliminated.

I happen to believe the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is one. The reason we are having so much trouble, frankly, is because of letters like this sent out by the president of WHYY-TV in Philadelphia, and as a result of numerous public broadcasting commercials and public broadcasting, both on radio and television, to write your Congressman and Senator and

say, "Do not let them take Barney and Big Bird off the air. Do not let them take our subsidy away. Go out there and lobby on our behalf," hiring lobbyists and people to come down here and try to convince us to keep the money flowing. Keep that money flowing to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

I have written a letter of I think three or four pages in response to the constituents who have asked me. It is a letter that I gave a lot of thought to, and I said here are all the reasons why I think the Corporation for Public Broadcasting should be cut.

These stations in Pennsylvania decided they are going to write a letter responding to my letter and lobbying and pointing out all the flaws in my letter.

I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD following my statement a copy of this letter and a copy of my response point by point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President.

I will tell you that, while he says all these things are in fact not true, the fact of the matter is they are all true. Everything that I have in that letter is exactly right. He is providing information. I can go through just some of them. I suggest in my letter that there are many private sector sponsors who would like to be involved, and who could—and in fact are—supporting public broadcasting. And we could in fact privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which is the entity by which the Federal funds flow through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. GRAMS. I yield an additional 2 minutes from the time allotted to the majority leader for his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

I say you can privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which is an entity located here in Washington that the Federal dollars are allocated through. He responds and says that public broadcasting stations may not be Federal regulation be for-profit enterprises. Well, I did not say anything about for-profit stations being owned by the private sector. What I said was that we could privatize the organization that provides some funding to those stations, which in fact we can, and which the Senator from South Dakota, Senator PRESSLER, is in the process of trying to do by statute.

This is the bait and switch which is going on in this letter. In his letter he says:

The Senator describes American public broadcasting—an effort in constant threat of financial starvation, forbidden to sell anything and forbidden to make a profit—as "well-endowed."

I do say they are well endowed. I justify that by saying that "Barney" and

"Sesame Street" combined have royalties of about \$2 billion of which the Corporation for Public Broadcasting gets virtually nothing.

Various other programs—I have my share of "Shining Time Station Puzzles" for my 4-year-old and my 2-year-old. I have my share of other things from the "Puzzle Kids," whatever they are called, something like that. I do not know—"The Puzzle Gang." I have a bunch of this stuff—Mr. Rogers, a wonderful man from my hometown of Pittsburgh, who does a tremendous job for the community, does a tremendous show. But these assets can and should be used, instead of going to public broadcasting, go to the taxpayers, who go out and work darned hard for their dollars, to have it funneled through here to pay for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, to pay for a lot of the other things.

He mentions one other thing. He says the Senator's comments are ideological, that I come at it from an "ideological standpoint." He is absolutely right. I do come at it from an ideological standpoint. My ideology is that the Federal Government should not be supporting these things, that we need to reduce the size of Government. But it certainly is not from the ideological standpoint that I do not agree with what is on there. That is irrelevant. Does the Federal Government, when we have limited resources, have a role of supporting broadcast television in an era where broadcast television is almost as much a dinosaur as the crank phone when we are going to cable and direct satellite communications? We should support public broadcast television? It is ridiculous. We have to move into the 21st century in the U.S. Senate just like public broadcasting has to move in the 21st century in telecommunications.

That is what this is all about. I can tell you that we are going to have a battle about this. I do not know if we are going to win. I tell you, if we do not win, I question the sincerity of the people in this Chamber to really do anything about reducing the deficit. I really question whether we are really willing to stare at children who are facing 82 percent tax rates, as PAUL COVERDELL says, in 10 years only having five Federal programs left if we just do nothing. How can we stare those children in the face, that we say, as in the Daschle amendment, we care about so much? How can you care about someone and let them keep 18 percent of what they earn? How can you care about someone if you are not willing to stand up and defeat the special interests and do what is right for the long-term interest of the American children? This Daschle amendment, putting more money in programs today, is not the answer. Preserving the fiscal integrity of tomorrow is what really is going to help America's children.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

TEXT OF SENATOR RICK SANTORUM'S LETTER TO CONSTITUENTS

Federal funds for public broadcasting are administered and distributed by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB). The CPB makes direct grants to public television and radio stations, as well as grants to the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) and national Public Radio (NPR) for program projects and productions. In 1994, the CPB received \$253 million from Congress.

The majority of funding for public television and radio does not come from the CPB, but rather from member stations, educational institutions, corporations, and private citizens. For example, in 1993 the CPB provided only 14.2% of the industry-wide spending for public broadcasting. It is also important to note that PBS and NPR are not divisions of the CPB; they are private, non-profit organizations that utilize federal funds to supplement their operating budget. In 1993, the CPB provided only 13.9% of the total PBS budget and 4% of the total NPR budget. It is therefore not accurate to suggest that "Sesame Street" and other popular PBS shows would be forced off the air if CPB funding were reduced or eliminated.

In this time of federal downsizing and fiscal reform, tough decisions need to be made about government spending. Last year Congress reduced funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), which is vital to Pennsylvania senior citizens. Congress has also taken steps to close the Philadelphia Naval Shipyards, which employs thousands of Pennsylvania residents. With cuts of this nature taking place, it is hard for me to justify the continued use of federal resources to subsidize the well-endowed public broadcasting industry.

If Congress acts to scale back, privatize, or eliminate the CPB, I am confident that the resulting loss of funds for public television and radio will be compensated by new corporate sponsorship and public support. Several major corporations have already expressed interest in supporting a privatized Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

In addition, PBS, a major contributor and supporter of public television, has yet to utilize its full range of funding options. You may or may not be aware that commercial products related to Barney, the amiable children's character on PBS, grossed almost \$1 billion last year. PBS receives almost none of these profits because it chose not to secure licensing rights for commercial products related to PBS shows. PBS will also receive very little of the \$800 million grossed by "Sesame Street" products. To put it bluntly, I do not think taxpayers should pay to put Barney on public TV for Barney to make billions of dollars. If PBS were to secure even a small percentage of these earnings through product licensing, the lost share of federal funds would be easily replaced, or even doubled.

Congress has also provided other means of support or public broadcasting besides direct funding through the CPB. Over thirty years ago, Congress directed the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to designate specific VHF television channels for educational broadcasting. This FCC frequency allocation program continues to allow public television and radio stations to remain exempt from the sizeable fees and costs paid by private commercial stations. Congress has also given non-profit status to public broadcasting stations, allowing them to receive

tax-deductible contributions and avoid paying corporate taxes, which amounts to a federal government subsidy. I continue to support these significant accommodations made by Congress for public broadcasting.

After considering the factors of private funding, commercial licensing, and additional federal supports for public broadcasting, I have reached the conclusion that the future of public broadcasting in the United States is not dependent on continued funding through the CPB. The CPB has played an important role in expanding access to public broadcasting and improving program quality since its establishment in 1967. Now that these primary goals have been achieved, I believe it may be time for Congress to evaluate proposals to downsize, privatize, or discontinue this organization.

Americans have shown a strong commitment to supporting public television and radio. This commitment will continue as long as PBS, NPR, and their local affiliates remain committed to the production and broadcasting of programs that enrich the educational and cultural life of our nation.

(tv 12 WHYY 91 fm),
INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST,
Philadelphia, PA, February 21, 1995.

Thank you for sending the copy of the letter you have received from Senator Santorum. It seems clear that the national conversation about public broadcasting is based more on political posturing than on reasoning and fact. That conversation needs to be elevated.

The Senator suggests that "tough decisions need to be made about government spending." He's right, and most Americans agree. Why, however, does he join those who aim so fiercely at a national instrumentality that provides educational and cultural services and earns the great majority of its money from non-federal sources? Why does he join those who single out, with great fanfare, a national educational effort that accounts for only .0003 of the national budget?

To me, the answer is that Senator Santorum writes from an ideological standpoint, and his arguments are the common ones in the current national discussion about public broadcasting. The danger is that misinformation is too often treated as fact.

The Senator describes American public broadcasting—an effort in constant threat of financial starvation, forbidden to sell anything and forbidden to make a profit—as "well-endowed." The facts are, simply and clearly, otherwise.

The Senator suggests that "several major corporations have already expressed interest in supporting a privatized Corporation for Public Broadcasting." This is a pretty far-fetched notion, since CPB is merely a funnel for federal money. Does he mean that a private corporation will provide the \$285 million each year currently appropriated by CPB? It seems unlikely. In addition, public broadcasting stations may not, by federal regulation, be owned by for-profit enterprises.

He goes on to suggest that commercial products resulting from the Barney series could fuel PBS, which shows a basic lack of understanding concerning public broadcasting and how it subsists.

The Senator's suggestion that "Congress directed the Federal Communications Commission to designate specific VHF television channels for educational broadcasting" is incorrect. The FCC's Sixth Report and Order of 1952, which set aside both VHF and UHF channels for educational use, was not ordered by Congress.

He goes on to suggest that the "non-profit status" of public broadcasting stations was "given" to them by Congress. That is untrue.

The nonprofit status was ordered by the FCC, which prohibited commercials on the new stations, in order to eliminate possible competition between commercial and educational stations. He also claims that "private commercial stations" pay "sizeable fees and costs" that the educational stations do not. This is simply not so.

It's important that the current conversation about public broadcasting in America be elevated to a reasonable, civil level, a level on which fact, opinion and fantasy can be separated, a level on which ideology plays a minimal role and a level on which service to Americans is the goal.

We appreciate your continued interest.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK BREITENFELD, JR.,
President.

THE ERRONEOUS WHYY LETTER

From: Frederick Breitenfeld, Jr., President,
WHYY, TV12, 91 FM, Independence Mall
West, Philadelphia, PA.

WHYY/Frederick Breitenfeld, Jr.	Facts/RJS Position
"Why . . . does [RJS] join those who aim so fiercely at a national instrumentality that provides educational and cultural services . . ."	My aim is fierce at deficit reduction. Government spending cuts should be even handed. CPB can't be excluded from deficit reduction cuts affecting all federal spending.
"Why does he join those who single out . . . a national educational effort that accounts for only .0003 of the national budget?"	Should Congress only single out massive federal programs? Should CPB, merely because it's a small program, not contribute its share to deficit reduction?
"To me, the answer is that Senator Santorum writes from an ideological standpoint . . ."	Yes! Less federal government and eliminating the deficit are the ideological reasons underlying these cuts. I believe the vast majority of Pennsylvanians share this view.
"The Senator describes American public broadcasting—an effort in constant threat of financial starvation, forbidden to sell anything and forbidden to make a profit—as 'well-endowed.'"	It sounds as if Mr. Breitenfeld agrees that the CPB should be able to reap the commercial rewards of its educational ventures such as "Barney" and "Sesame Street," all the more reason for reduced federal funding.
[Regarding RJS's mention of corporate support of CPB privatization]: "Does he mean that a private corporation will provide the \$285 million each year currently appropriated to CPB?"	No. I mean there are many corporations which, through tax incentives, would readily support an independent, privatized CPB.
"He goes on to suggest that commercial products resulting from the Barney series could fuel PBS, which shows a basic lack of understanding concerning public broadcasting and how it subsists."	Fact: Barney grossed almost \$1 billion dollars in 1994, PBS should be allowed to reap the reward of its product.
"He goes on to suggest that the 'non-profit status' of public broadcasting stations was 'given' to them by Congress. That is untrue. The nonprofit status was ordered by the FCC . . ."	Congress passed the following: "There is authorized to be established a non profit corporation, to be known as the Corporation For Public Broadcasting," which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government." 47 USC 395(b)
"He also claims that 'private commercial stations' pay 'sizeable fees and costs' that the educational stations do not."	Commercial stations pay taxes. Commercial stations pay processing and regulatory fees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a reminder, there are 2 minutes remaining of the majority leader's time.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to reiterate why we believe this amendment is important.

Fundamentally, it goes to the heart of what it is that we as Democrats believe we are here for: protecting working families, investing in children, and

doing that in a meaningful way without reducing the overall commitment to deficit reduction one iota.

That is really what this amendment does. It provides the kind of commitment we need for working families, and the commitment especially we need for children. But it also recognizes the need for deficit reduction because children and working families are directly affected by that as well.

We do so by restoring some of the cuts that were made in areas that directly affect children in the most significant way—children dependent upon child care, so that working families can meet their obligations at the workplace; Head Start for children who depend upon a program that has now been in use for more than 30 years, clearly which has shown to be one of the most important ways with which to prepare children to be better students and to be more able to cope with all of the challenges in early life.

We also protect young adults interested in national service. These young people are committing themselves to their country in a way that makes a significant contribution to our country through national service and community assistance, and at the same time to generate the ability to go back to college or to go to college in the first place to advance their education in as many ways as they can.

We also recognize that women, infants, and children of all ages really depend upon adequate nutrition. If they do not have adequate nutrition, they really do not have the ability to ensure good health. If we learned anything in the debate over the last couple of years about health care, it is that perhaps the best investment we can make is an investment in preventive care. Making sure people stay healthy is the best way to ensure that they are not going to need expensive care later on.

That is exactly what the Women, Infants and Children Program does. It assures adequate nutrition, adequate nutrition assures adequate good health, and with good health we assure the opportunities for young people and for women to be productive citizens in this country.

Aid to schools, of course, is something that we have long felt is perhaps the single best investment this country can make. As we look at the real defense of this country, as we look at ways to maximize the security and the strength of this Nation, there is no better way to do it than to ensure that our schools have the resources they need to prepare young children to be good adults later on.

Obviously, we have gone through some very disappointing days last week, in that we thought we were going to have a good debate as early as last Thursday on this very issue, whether we ought to be able to protect 1 million children who are affected by all of these programs. We were denied that debate. And, unfortunately, as well, the majority has now offered a

second-degree amendment that would gut this amendment and would further the attack on some of these programs directly affecting kids and families.

So we are anxious to debate priorities as we go about the difficult task of balancing the budget. But I hope that we would not replace a vote on the priorities we place on kids and families with a vote on cutting the deficit further. We really ought to accomplish both things.

We recognize the importance of deficit reduction. We recognize the importance of investment in children and families. That balance is really what we are trying to strike in the first place. We agree that the deficit has to be reduced. We agree that the \$15.3 billion that bill now provides is a significant reduction and ought to be supported.

Where we apparently disagree is whether or not we could take some of the funding in the out years for FEMA, funding that goes beyond what even the House has proposed, and use it to direct resources to people who are really dealing with emergencies right now.

It is an emergency if you are a young family and cannot get child care. In some cases it is going to be an emergency if some of these schools do not get impact aid funding or some of the money that they are counting on in this year's budget to ensure that they meet their obligations later on.

So it is really a very fundamental question of providing the delicate balance between addressing those concerns, the investments in the families of 1 million children, and investing, as well, in meaningful deficit reduction over the course of the next 24 months.

We also, of course, had an opportunity to address the issue of billionaires who renounce their citizenship in order to avoid paying taxes on their fortunes. I am very pleased that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has indicated his determination to ultimately resolve this issue. I think the Senate will go on record one way or another, hopefully sooner rather than later, that that is not something that we support; that we recognize that, as we are trying to make very tough decisions about priorities and about kids and where the resources ought to go, to say no to child care, no to Head Start, no to AmeriCorps, but yes to billionaires who renounce their citizenship is not a set of priorities I think anybody in this Chamber is very comfortable with. So we want to find a way to deal with that issue, as well.

I applaud the effort that others have made to talk about priorities as we deal with the rescission package and the offsets required for FEMA. I hope, as we go through this whole debate, we will be very cognizant of the need to ensure a proper balance between that investment and meaningful deficit reduction.

We want some bipartisan cooperation here, as well. We want to ensure that our amendment is adequately debated,

that we have a vote on this amendment; not one in the second degree, not on some substitute, but an up-or-down vote on this amendment, so we can say, without equivocation, these are our priorities, unaffected by whatever additional amendments others may want to offer.

We want to have a clear statement of priorities and a clear statement of intent with regard to what our investment truly is.

We are at a crossroads. I think that crossroads, to a certain extent, is going to be affected by decisions we make on this particular bill. We can choose to work together and find ways with which to ensure that Democrat concerns can be addressed as well as Republican concerns.

But second-degree amendments used to prevent us from having an up-or-down vote on something we hold to be very important sends the wrong message, I believe, about our desire to work together to accommodate both sides as we take up very serious legislation.

We have legitimate amendments that reflect our thoughts about the direction our country should take on balancing the budget. Whether it is in this bill or whether it is in bills that will be taken up at a later date, I hope that the majority would allow votes to be cast on each and every one of these issues.

We have a difference of opinion with the majority over how best to cut \$1.3 billion. We have about \$1.2 trillion to go as we balance the budget over the course of the next 7 years. We are not going to get there unless we work together.

The approach taken by the majority on this bill so far does not bode well. The overwhelming majority, if not all of our colleagues, on the Democratic side support the amendment that we have laid down.

Let there be no mistake. This was not done at the behest of the President of the United States, as has been suggested. This proposal was the response of our caucus. We feel compelled to stand up for children. We feel compelled to speak up for working families.

If the other side moves to table our amendment and has the votes, there will be others offered to address the needs of working families by cutting other less urgent priorities. But we are willing to offer them in a deliberate process that can be performed expeditiously, and I hope the majority would respect that.

If, on the other hand, our amendment would be agreed to, we could complete our work on this bill even more expeditiously. And I hope that remains a possibility. I hope that Republicans and Democrats could agree that, indeed, we must reduce the deficit, indeed we must find ways with which to maximize the opportunities to fund FEMA, but I think we would also agree that respecting the investment that we have

made in our commitment to kids and our commitment to schools and our commitment to working families ought to be respected, as well.

So, we really have a choice here, Mr. President. I hope that we could support both the need to ensure that the Federal Emergency Management Administration has the resources necessary to continue its extraordinary work in providing emergency assistance to communities all over the country, and I hope that we could also move ahead with meaningful deficit reduction.

But I also hope that in addition to those two priorities, what I have said about our commitment to investment in kids in education could be at the top of the list as well.

There have been calls on the other side of the aisle to privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the majority leader's amendment is the first step in laying that groundwork by cutting the funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. That is another issue. I hope that those of us who are opposed to taking that draconian approach toward public broadcasting will have the opportunity to debate it up or down.

But the issue here is not public broadcasting; it is not anything other than what we have listed on this chart. The issue here is child care; it is Head Start; it is giving kids an opportunity to earn college access and college tuition by participating in national service; it is ensuring we have good preventive care; it is ensuring that we have the kind of investments in schools that we really need if, indeed, we are serious about maintaining the commitment to schools to maximize their educational opportunities to the children who walk in the doors each and every day.

So those really are the issues here, Mr. President. We hope that people understand the need to restore the child care opportunities for 5,000 children, as we have listed. It tells working families that we want them to continue to work and to generate all the income their talents will allow and we are going to assist them in their child care needs. Without child care, many low-income parents may find themselves on welfare. Our amendment will enable those parents to continue work.

We had an opportunity just last week to meet a couple who participated in a news conference with us on minimum wage. It was a couple from Pennsylvania who had been on welfare who came to the conclusion less than a year ago that they were not going to allow themselves to be dependent anymore, who decided they were going to go out and find jobs, and find the kinds of opportunities in the private sector we have been admonishing them to go out and find.

Unfortunately, all they could find were minimum-wage jobs or something slightly above minimum wage. I think, in one case, one of the jobs they had paid \$5 an hour rather than \$4.25. They did not have health insurance. They

have two children. The children get sick from time to time. They have no way with which to address their children's illness. They try to keep their health care bills low, but they said, "It was so much easier when we were on welfare. We had Medicaid. We could go into the hospital and we knew at least we had minimal coverage. We had income that was almost as good as what we have right now, and we did not have to worry about child care."

That is exactly the dilemma a lot of young families are facing. They do not want to be on welfare. They want to find alternatives. What we are trying to tell them is if you go out and do the right thing, we are going to reward work. We want to reward work by making sure that your income at the end of a hard-working week is not going to relegate you to poverty, even though you may be struggling.

We know that you have to go out and find perhaps a second job, and we are willing to accept that. But if you go out and make sure you do what we expect you to do, that is, not rely upon welfare to meet your needs, we want to the extent we can help you with meaningful child care, and with meaningful pay for the work that you do each and every day. We want to send you the message that we are glad that you made the decision not to be on welfare and that you are going to continue to be productive citizens within your community by working at jobs that we hope will begin paying more.

But that is really the issue here with regard to taking care of their children, with regard to educating their children, with regard to providing them with adequate nutrition, with regard to ensuring that once their children go to school that they have the necessary resources to be taught and to be as competitive in the United States as they need to be, given the competition in other countries.

So, Mr. President, that is really what our message is. We want to make work pay. We want to make work pay by providing meaningful opportunities for children who may need child care support. We want to provide meaningful opportunities for children who are beneficiaries of the Head Start Program. And we also, as I said, want to help 36,000 young people who will benefit from national service by the continuation of a program that, in our view, has worked exceedingly well in the very short period of time that we have seen it in operation.

If our amendment is not adopted, a promise will be broken to tens of thousands of young Americans, the communities they serve, and the charitable groups they help. These organizations and communities have now been told we are going to have this program there; it is going to work; you can count on people assisting you as you go through the difficult decisions you have to with regard to how you are going to cope with your budget and how you are going to address many of

the operational challenges that you face every day.

This program is really a partnership, a partnership with communities, a partnership with organizations, a partnership with young people who recognize that when there is an expectation that assistance can be provided for college that, indeed, the reciprocal responsibility is to ensure that those children and those young people understand that there is a commitment required of them, as well.

So national service is something I hope is around for a long period of time, a program that I believe deserves our full support. Simply to eliminate it, to forget its success already, would be very shortsighted, indeed. In fact, I hope that Republicans can join us, as they have in the past, in recognizing just what a tremendous opportunity it is for a lot of young people.

So, Mr. President, I think the message is very clear; it is pretty simple. The message is simply that we want to do what everybody here says we ought to do, and that is reduce the deficit to the extent that we can; provide the funds necessary to ensure that the Federal Emergency Management Administration is given the adequate funds necessary to continue in their role; but then, third, we also recognize the very delicate balance that we have in providing the investment that we need to provide in ensuring the continuity of a lot of the services that we now provide schools, children, and working families.

So I hope that as we make our decision about this amendment, we understand that there is a need to maintain that balance; we understand that it sends exactly the wrong message to say no, we are going to have to cut child care, Head Start, cut funding for something as valuable as national service, but somehow we are going to protect those expatriates who renounce their citizenship in order to save tax dollars. We should not say that we are going to protect the billionaires, but we are not going to protect the children.

I know that there are many people in this Chamber who would support that notion, but I think it sends the wrong message if we are on record as willing to allow the billionaire expatriates to avoid paying taxes and yet vote to cut successful children's programs as dramatically as this.

So I hope, Mr. President, we can be cognizant of the message our vote on this amendment will send. We want to ensure that deficit reduction, that FEMA funding, and that investments in kids and working families are all protected. This amendment does that. It does that by restoring some of the balance that was lost, especially in the House, restored in part in the Senate Appropriations Committee, and now can be restored almost in its entirety by voting in favor of the amendment we are offering now.

We will have more to say about it certainly tomorrow morning and in the

coming debate over perhaps the course of the next day or so. I hope we can convince our Republican colleagues that this is an amendment worthy of their support.

I would like to see a strong bipartisan message that Republicans and Democrats support the commitment we have made to kids, the commitment we have made to working families. I certainly hope that before the end of this debate, Republicans and Democrats can demonstrate that support and vote in favor of this amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 40 minutes to be equally divided on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, can the President inform the Senate as to what the current unanimous-consent agreement allows with regard to remaining time on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are nearly 26 minutes left under the unanimous-consent order on this debate.

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask the Senator from Iowa whether it is his intent to seek 40 minutes in addition to that 26 minutes? I have not yielded back the 26 minutes, so I want to protect that in case other Senators may be interested in coming to the floor to speak on the amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY. My request would be in addition to the 26 minutes.

Mr. DASCHLE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I rise to speak in strong support of the committee's actions regarding AmeriCorps. I particularly want to commend Senator BOND for his work in this area. But I also have had an opportunity to hear Senators KYL, ASHCROFT, SANTORUM and FAIRCLOTH speak very eloquently on the very same subject. I compliment them for their fine remarks.

I know that Senator BOND has been closely reviewing the AmeriCorps Program and has found, as I have, that there are many unanswered questions concerning AmeriCorps, and further increases at this time do not seem to be advisable.

I have been looking closely at AmeriCorps since last July when I began a series of letters requesting information and data about AmeriCorps. Unfortunately, I did not receive answers to many of the questions that I asked, or the information I received was either misleading or incomplete.

Recently, AmeriCorps has promised me access to much of the data that I requested, and I hope this reflects a genuine change of attitude and a willingness to cooperate.

However, even from the information that I have been provided, there are many reasons to question the merits of this program. Let me first focus on the cost of the program, because in reviewing the actual AmeriCorps grant awards, we have found program after program where costs are \$30,000 to \$40,000 per AmeriCorps worker.

For example, the organization ACORN recently received a grant of over \$1 million from AmeriCorps. ACORN also receives funds from Fannie Mae as well. This program is for 42 AmeriCorps workers, and the cost per worker of over \$41,000.

In comparison we could help 20 young people go to college through the use of Pell grants with that same amount of money. Let me add that the costs of the ACORN program do not include the significant Federal overhead, nor the fact that many AmeriCorps workers drop out of the program. Thus, the cost per successful worker, which ought to be the true cost measurement of this program, would be significantly higher than \$41,000.

As I mentioned, the cost of \$41,000 per worker is by no means out of the ordinary for AmeriCorps. Legal Services Corporation received almost \$1 million from AmeriCorps with the cost per AmeriCorps worker of over \$48,000. Recently, AmeriCorps finally admitted that in one grant to a Los Angeles school district the taxpayers were paying a consultant \$50 an hour—that is an hour, Mr. President.

We are being told that AmeriCorps is beneficial. I do not know what benefit the taxpayers are getting by having somebody on an hourly wage earning the equivalent of over \$100,000 per year. This is outrageous and, of course, it gives other boondoggles a bad name.

Mr. President, let me compare AmeriCorps workers with the Boy Scouts, for instance—a well-known group of people who are out doing good every day. They do not receive any money from AmeriCorps. In fact, they were turned down for funding by AmeriCorps so that funding could be provided to such traditional volunteer groups as the EPA and the Department of Agriculture.

The Boy Scouts have over 5.3 million young people and adults performing volunteer work and helping in their communities. According to the Boy Scouts' 1993 annual report, for the National Capital Area Council, their total expenses were \$4.8 million, for over 50,000 Scouts, that is \$95 per Scout per year.

Well, that sounds about right, does it not? The Federal Government pays someone \$50 an hour for 750 hours of work for a total of \$37,500 to consult about volunteering. And the private sector can give you almost 400 actual volunteers with the same amount of money without a dime of cost to the taxpayers. Let me say that these Scouts are doing just great work. For example, last November, 40,000 Scouts in the DC area distributed 1 million

bags to doorsteps of homes in their communities to help a food collection effort. The next week the Scouts returned to collect the filled bags and to bring them to a central distribution center, which was distributing the bags then to the needy during the holiday season.

I want to now clarify a few points regarding AmeriCorps. First, AmeriCorps workers are spending a significant amount of their time doing work other than helping their communities. For example, under AmeriCorps' own regulations published in the Federal Register, AmeriCorps workers can spend taxpayers' money studying for the GED. I do think that it is fine and good that young people are taking time to study for the GED. However, it is questionable whether our taxpayers' money should pay some young people to study for the GED, when hundreds of thousands study for it without receiving a single dollar from the taxpayers.

The second point I want to make, in summary, is that AmeriCorps was presented to Congress as a way to help young people pay for college. Yet, according to AmeriCorps' own admission, at least a fifth of the workers have not attended college and probably will not attend college. They are not receiving an educational award. They are instead getting cash awards, as was revealed by NBC news very recently. For many, this is just another Government jobs program.

Mr. President, AmeriCorps is a program with costs that are far exceeding the estimates provided by the administration. It is a program that may not be managing the taxpayers' money properly. In many respects, it is a questionable use of taxpayer funds. Since we could certainly stretch these dollars a lot further in programs such as Pell grants.

Finally, AmeriCorps is a proposal that is duplicating, at enormous expense, services that are being provided by the private sector. I, like Senator BOND and so many others, am a skeptic of this program. I am holding off final judgment until I receive the information promised me by AmeriCorps and by the results of the General Accounting Office report that is reviewing the cost of the AmeriCorps Program. Once the data is in, the program may need reinvention. Certainly, we can accomplish the goals of this program without awarding grants with costs of \$40,000-plus per worker.

To increase funding for AmeriCorps at this time, with so little known and with so many problems that are known, is not in the best interest of the taxpayers. We need to proceed cautiously with this program until all of the data is in.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against any efforts to increase funding for this program.

I yield the floor and yield back any of my unused time.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. How much time is remaining on the Republican side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just over 12 minutes remain in the debate.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I want to continue the discussion on the Dole amendment which, again, provides an additional cut in spending of \$1.3 billion for this fiscal year, the year we are in right now. It would supersede the Daschle amendment that would put back another \$1.3 billion in spending, and it leaves in place the \$1.3 billion that was going to be taken away from the original purpose of this bill, which was a disaster relief fund.

So \$1.3 billion is scheduled to go to California under this bill. Again, the reason for this bill even being here is because of the earthquake disaster in California.

The amendment of the Democratic leader takes \$1.3 billion, takes that away, and replaces it with a whole bunch of other programs.

What we do is leave the money there, take his programs away and, in fact, reduces the deficit by \$1.3 billion more.

We think that is the general direction that we should try to reduce the deficit and programs that we believe merit further scrutiny and reduction without being disruptive here in the middle of a fiscal year.

One of the programs, as the Senator from Iowa just very articulately said, is the AmeriCorps Program. This is the one area where not only is there a contention whether we should cut it, but where the Democratic leader wants to increase funding for AmeriCorps from the current bill, and the majority leader wants to decrease funding from the bill.

It is the one area we have in common on the two amendments, but we are going in opposite directions. I think it is appropriate, because it probably represents the best discussion of the differences between the direction of the two parties when it comes to the role of Government in providing services to individuals, and, really, the concept of what Government should do and what can be left to the private sector.

Interestingly enough, we have a program such as the AmeriCorps Program which hires Corps volunteers. Most people say, if you hire someone, they are no longer a volunteer.

That is somehow lost on the people who created the AmeriCorps Program, because hiring a volunteer is, in fact, part of the vernacular. They hire volunteers in the AmeriCorps.

What do the volunteers get paid? We heard the number around here, I will give you a number, from Wisconsin, which is put together by Representative TOM PETRI from Wisconsin. That AmeriCorps volunteer, the one who was, in fact, mentioned by President Clinton, I guess it is Kentucky, a woman who was mentioned by President Clinton in his speech on the state

of the Union, who teaches second-graders to read in rural Kentucky, a compelling story that the President used during his State of the Union Address. This person gets paid \$9,000—not a lot of money—but \$9,000 in stipend pay. In addition, she gets a voucher to pay for her higher education of a little over \$5,000; she gets roughly \$8,000 in child care benefit paid to by the Government under this program; she gets Medicaid coverage which is \$4,000 for her family of five; because most of her benefits are tax free she qualifies for another \$3,200 in earned income tax credits, making this job that she has equivalent to a job that pays \$34,000 in the private sector. Now, that is a lot for a volunteer.

I happen to agree with what the President of the Ohio-West Virginia YMCA said:

The national service movement is about institutionalizing Federal funding for national and community service. It is about changing the language and the understanding of service to eliminate the words "volunteer" and "community service" and in their place implant the idea that service is something paid for by the Government.

That was someone from the YMCA.

This is dangerous program. People say, wow, dangerous program. Is that not extreme? How can this program be dangerous? This is dangerous to the whole philosophy of who America is, what we are all about.

Are we a country that is a great country because we have great Government employees? I would think that the people around the world look at America and they say we are a great country, but probably not anywhere in their top 50 of their reasons is that we have great bureaucrats, that is the reason America is a great country.

I can guarantee on the top 10 of any list is that America has a great spirit of community and helping your neighbor and voluntarism. As de Tocqueville said, "America is great because it is good. When it ceases being good, it will no longer be great."

Paying volunteers decreases our goodness. It is not the American spirit. It is not reaching out to help your neighbor just because they are neighbors, not because you get paid for it.

Do not tell me all these compassionate stories of how these people are so wonderful because they are helping. They are wonderful. It is great to help. But they are no different than the insurance agent who helps someone who comes and has their car wrecked and comes and helps then. It is their job. It is a wonderful job. It is an important job. It is necessary for the insurance person who helps. But do not raise this to some elevated standard of national and community service when, in fact, it is paid bureaucrat.

I have a suggestion. I happen to agree that there is a lot of work out there that can and should be done by folks in the genre of the AmeriCorps Program. We have a solution for that. It targets the people who need the jobs. It targets the people that need the training, who need the work experience.

I heard the Democratic leader say "all these young people in AmeriCorps." Again, talk to the facts. You can be 60 years of age and be in AmeriCorps. It is not focused at young people. You can be a multimillionaire and you can be in AmeriCorps. There is no age other than up to 60, and there is no income qualifications.

Now, I can tell Members that we have a pool of people who desperately need help, who desperately want to work to feel that they can give back. The community needs them as much as they need the community. It is people on public assistance. People on welfare.

We create a program as we do in the Republican welfare reform bill that puts people needing job skills, training, and just some success in their life, give them the opportunity to go out and work that job. Why not give them the chance? Why give some rich doctor's kid \$34,000 a year to go to school?

That is not what this program should be about. That is not a program, I do not think, this body wants to defend. It sounds so grand and it sounds so wonderful when they talk about how wonderful voluntarism is, but, folks, look at the facts.

As well-meaning as this program is, this is a program that is another social experiment based in Washington that is destructive of our nature and our character as Americans. We should end it. Quickly, decisively, and hopefully, tomorrow.

I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. President, as has been mentioned during the course of the debate on the Daschle amendment, part of the Daschle amendment applies to restoration of some \$210 million for the AmeriCorps Program. This program has been addressed earlier, in the course of the afternoon, and I will take a few moments to comment upon it.

First of all, Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to hear from my colleagues who talk about how even a stipend which effectively is the minimum wage should not be available for individuals who want to volunteer in their community.

There are many in this institution who would evidently like to preserve voluntarism just for the very wealthy individuals in our country. There are a lot of needy kids, a lot of poor people, who have a sense of idealism and a commitment to service, and who would like to be able to take the time that others who have the financial resources can take in order to volunteer and to do good works.

The AmeriCorps concept is to give people an opportunity to work in their communities. It does provide a stipend which is basically the minimum wage. It does provide an award at the end of service to encourage people to go back to school, or to go to school. These are people who otherwise probably would not be able to afford it.

The educational award is about \$4,700. We basically took what was going to be an average cost for tuition in State universities across the country. Most of those State universities' costs have gone up. But it is still a good start. So AmeriCorps lets young people go there—it combines service and education.

I am so interested to hear some people say that some of these programs are not going well. Talk to your Governors. This is a State and local responsibility, not a Federal program. Ask your Governors how it is working. I know that in Massachusetts, the participants do a superb job.

There are outstanding business men and women. There are local community leaders and activists—all of whom are involved in the shaping and the fashioning of the program.

If there are some programs that are not working, I am sure Eli Segal wants to know about them. We will get busy trying to do something about them. But the fact of the matter is, this is not a Federal program controlled from the top down. This is a program that is developed and run in local communities, with local support and initiative.

I would like to mention a recent study which surveyed what 1,654 AmeriCorps workers accomplished in 5 months. These 1,654 workers are only 8 percent of the 20,000 total AmeriCorps participants.

These 1,654 people taught and tutored 15,480 children from preschool to junior high school. These children had no other opportunity to get this kind of additional educational help and assistance.

These 1,654 people established afterschool programs for 4,650 children. Those are children of working-class and working families, children who probably would have been left unattended if they had not been involved in those afterschool programs. The AmeriCorps participants work under supervision to develop tutorial programs and other effective programs.

These 1,654 people organized community service projects for 4,400 children.

These 1,654 people escorted some 8,500 children in schools through safe corridors. We can say, what does that really mean? The fact is, if you get children who live in difficult areas with high crime rates, the AmeriCorps people work out a system so the children can go safely to the school and return to school. Maybe it is difficult for us to understand what is happening out there in many of the urban areas—in the inner cities. But you have thousands of children who are so intimidated that they will not go to school. The AmeriCorps members have developed programs that have the broad support of the children and the parents, programs that permit the children to go to school through safe corridors.

These 1,654 people have been doing work with gangs to reduce gang violence, as well as work with victims of domestic violence and other troubled teenagers.

The list goes on—a number of immunization programs as well. I will include in the RECORD a list of the accomplishments—these are all accomplishments of only 1,654 volunteers, or 8 percent of the total, and these were randomly selected.

I should also mention the work that has been done in southern Texas on immunization programs. There are thousands and thousands of children today who are immunized, and without that program they would not have been immunized.

A study recently released of the first 5 months of the AmeriCorps program surveyed 52 program sites—or about 8 percent of the total sites. 1,654 participants—out of a total of 20,000—were working at these sites. Here is a sample of what they accomplished.

On education, the 1,654 AmeriCorps members worked largely in poor urban and rural areas;

They taught and tutored 9,068 preschool, elementary school, and junior high school students in basic educational skills;

They developed or ran enriched learning programs such as computer-based instruction, scientific experimentation, and peer tutoring for 6,414 children;

They established after-school and vacation programs for 4,656 children;

They organized community service projects for 4,469 children;

They provided literacy or employment training for 694 adults; and

They provided intensive educational support—including regular counseling—to 30 troubled teenagers living in group homes and 22 homeless pre-schoolers.

On public safety, the 1,654 AmeriCorps members worked to reduce violence in families, in schools, and on the streets;

They escorted 8,500 children to school through safe corridors;

They started 258 neighborhood safety programs and patrolled 250 vacant buildings;

They resolved 414 school conflicts that might otherwise have ended in violence, and taught conflict resolution to 8,119 children;

They counseled 1,350 potential or actual gang members and taught alternatives to violence;

They answered crisis hotlines and made referrals for 878 victims of sexual and domestic violence, and provided counseling for 470 such victims; and

They counseled 1,180 teenagers about alcohol and drug abuse.

On health, the 1,654 AmeriCorps members provided medical services and information to low-income families;

They trained 1,144 inner-city residents in CPR;

They provided emergency medical services to over 1,500 people;

They screened 1,100 low-income children for lead toxicity and other health risks;

They distributed 150 car seats to low-income families, and immunized 158 people;

They provided health counseling and transportation to 220 low-income families and over 5,000 individuals, and provided health information to over 4,500 individuals; and

They conducted workshops and distributed information on AIDS and tuberculosis to over 7,000 people, and conducted 301 HIV tests and counseled patients on the results.

On meeting basic needs, the 1,654 AmeriCorps members provided food, shelter, and support for senior citizens, low-income families, and homeless people;

They helped 123 elderly persons, 50 visually impaired adults, and 9 visually impaired children to live independently;

They organized weekly social activities for 400 nursing home residents;

They built wheelchair ramps at five low-income homes, four public buildings, and three parks;

They trained and supervised 58 volunteers and then repaired the homes of 256 senior citizens;

They renovated 238 inner-city housing units and 99 rural homes, and are working on the renovation of 121 more;

They refurbished 2 homeless shelters and began to renovate a home for senior citizens, a home for battered women, and a home for the formerly homeless;

They distributed food to more than 16,625 low-income people and packed 7,000 dinners and 32,000 breakfasts for the hungry;

They found shelter for 400 homeless families, and they sorted and distributed clothes to 350 homeless individuals;

They secured hospice housing for 27 people with AIDS and helped weekly to feed 1,250 people who are HIV-positive;

They provided housing information to over 500 low-income and homeless families; and

They found donated furniture, repaired it, and delivered it to 300 newly housed families;

On environmental and neighborhood restoration, the 1,654 AmeriCorps members responded to emergencies, restored the natural environment, and improved urban neighborhoods and parks;

They inspected and repaired 87 small dams, protecting 200 farms;

They provided disaster recovery assistance to 350 small land owners recovering from a flood, including advice on floodplain management;

They fought 2 major forest fires, saved 1 national park road from washing out, and joined 5 search and rescue efforts;

They planted 212,500 trees;

They restored 320 acres of wild land and 27 miles of riverbed and stream banks;

They removed 2,000 pounds of trash from an urban river;

They surveyed 5,700 acres of National Forest land and monitored reforestation efforts;

They built, restored, or maintained 311 campsites, 88 miles of trails, and 17 bridges, 4 beaches, and 3 duck blinds;

They converted 29 overgrown lots into green space, built 7 community gardens, and planted trees along 30 city blocks;

They created 4 playgrounds and restored, repaired, or maintained 19 historical landmarks;

They distributed 1,375 water-conserving toilets and 1,700 water-conserving showerheads in low-income neighborhoods; and

They renovated 11 community buildings, including an inner-city medical clinic, community centers, and public schools.

This is only a small sample of what community service participants have done. These examples are from a survey of 52 randomly selected AmeriCorps sites between September 1994 and January 1995. In 5 months, just 1,654 participants accomplished all this.

In all, there are 20,000 AmeriCorps participants in the field this year—and they will work for at least 9 months. They are doing important work—work that makes their communities and the Nation a better place.

In addition, hundreds of thousands of children are learning about community service through their schools with the help of grants from the “Learn and Serve” part of the Federal legislation. These children are learning the ideal of service, and they will keep it all their lives.

They are also getting things done in their communities. In Springfield, MA, Putnam Vocational High School had the highest dropout rate in the district. It received an \$1,800 grant through the “Learn and Serve” part of the program, and a group of students built a health facility for the school and the community. The students did the carpentry, electrical wiring, and construction work as part of their vocational courses. The result is a new health clinic that includes four examining rooms, two counseling rooms, a lab, and an auditorium for health education classes.

Is this the kind of initiative Republicans want to stop?

To my colleagues who say that we need to be spending our tax dollars wisely, I ask, isn't it wise to give young people the opportunity to tutor young children, build low-income housing, and work to prevent gangs?

We must not let partisan politics derail this important initiative. If you want to know whether community service is a good investment, ask the 20,000 Americans who are participating in full-time service through AmeriCorps or the more than 300,000 students from kindergarten through college who are doing service that is integrated into

their academic studies through "Learn and Serve."

Even more important, ask the people whose lives they have touched. Ask the homeless preschoolers who received counseling and education. Ask the children who can go to school with less fear of being shot. Ask the senior citizens who received support and home repairs. Ask the low-income families who received hot meals or new homes. Ask the small farmers whose land was protected from floods. Ask the parents who lived next door to the polluted river.

I do not know where the opposition to this program is coming from. With all the problems we have in this country, we are trying to give an opportunity to some 20,000 young Americans who want to do something for their communities. I can't believe the hours that are being taken to try and demolish that program. Surely we have other needs in our Nation and better things to do than trying to dismantle the voluntary service programs in this country.

Yet, Mr. President, it seems that there are those who want to do this. I think it is appropriate that we have a chance to debate this issue.

I want to just mention some of the businesses that are involved in partnerships with the nonprofit organizations that develop and sponsor the AmeriCorps programs.

In my own State, Timberland is a well-known and enormously successful corporation. It helps pay for participants' uniforms, sponsors individual teams of young people, provides employment opportunities for City Year graduates, and runs a national marketing campaign to benefit the program.

Timberland invested some \$5 million to be used over the next 5 years to help City Year expand in new communities across the Nation. They know that this is not just some program that is not worth its salt. They are not in there to just throw \$5 million around—throw \$5 million away. This is one of the really outstanding companies that has decided that City Year is a good, valuable program, and they are down there, working with these young people and helping to develop, on the basis of success in Boston, this program in other cities around the country.

The Bank of Boston is also allied with the City Year Program in Boston. The bank director, Ira Jackson, told the Boston Herald last week, "Our commitment to City Year has been the most successful philanthropic investment this institution has made in its 208-year history."

This is the Bank of Boston, and its association with the City Year Program is their best philanthropic investment in 208 years.

J.P. Morgan supports a program called AmeriCorps Leaders which places experienced graduates of community service programs in new programs to help them get started.

IBM helped develop an AmeriCorps program called Project First that aims to improve students' technology skills. Community service participants serve alongside retired IBM retirees in public schools to help bring the new technologies into the classrooms and integrate computers into the curriculum. In Boston, for example, they might work with children and with computers in the many schools that do not have a great range of electronics. They work with them, tie them into graduate students—for example, over at MIT or other technical institutes—to help those children work, to help them figure out their homework, to give them additional assistance with school. It is a very creative, imaginative program that is already paying off significantly with enhanced academic achievements and accomplishments. It is also an enormous source of satisfaction for the volunteers.

General Electric, in partnership with the United Way, has invested some \$250,000 in national community service.

These corporations I am mentioning, if they had listened this afternoon to the critics of these programs, they would not have understood what they were hearing. They would not have recognized the program that these critics were describing. They would have wondered what they are doing with their dough. These are major American companies and corporations that generally get value for every dollar that they spend. They have been enthusiastic about investing money in national and community service programs.

This is a partnership program. These programs are developed in local communities, with the help of businesses and nonprofit organizations, and then they are approved at State level.

Mr. SANTORUM assumed the chair.

Mr. KENNEDY. You know, this has been a modest program. We agreed to phase it in over 3 years—\$300 million, \$500 million, \$700 million. We are not saying this program will answer all the problems facing us. But certainly, we as a country ought to be able to challenge our young people to give something back to the community in return for all it has given to them. That is basically what this program is about. We are saying, "Look, during the period of the 1980's and early 1990's, we did not provide a lot of opportunities for young people who wanted to be a part of the process and be involved in the community."

Sure, voluntarism is a time-honored tradition and of significant value. Sure, it is taking place. Sure, there are a lot of young people in this country who do not need this kind of stipend and do not need this support. But I do think that, when you review these programs, you will find—I know in my own State, with which I am more familiar than with other parts of the country, although I have met AmeriCorps workers from all over—you will find that the participants are outstanding.

Maybe some of my colleagues who have been the most critical have spent a good deal of time in their States and in their local communities visiting these programs and talking with the participants. Maybe they have. I see my friend and colleague, the Presiding Officer now, from Pennsylvania. I should tell him that I have heard good witnesses from Philadelphia who talked about this program. Pennsylvania has been an important leader in developing these programs, both in cities and in rural areas. We have had inspirational testimony about the difference that this program has made in those young people's lives.

I think we ought to be able to reach out to young people across this country who are trying to make a difference for their communities and for their Nation. I think we ought to support them in their efforts. I am proud of the AmeriCorps Program. I am proud of the young people who serve in this program, who are trying to give something back to their communities. I think the program deserves the support of this Congress. I am very hopeful it will have that support.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I yield myself time from the distinguished minority leader's allocated time. How much time is remaining under that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 33 minutes and 48 seconds.

Mr. BREAUX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, my colleagues, I have listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon, and last week to some extent, to my colleagues speak on the program known as National Service or AmeriCorps. Unfortunately, I think it has become more of a political debate than it has been a debate on the merits of this concept.

I was thinking the other day that if two Members of Congress, perhaps two Members of the Senate, would have the opportunity to sit down one evening and pretend that they were neither Republicans nor Democrats and they would say to each other, "Well, let us for the sake of argument see if we can in the privacy of this room sit down and come up with a program, not thinking about who gets the credit, but come up with a program designed to bring about new ideas and how we might teach to our young men and women in this country something about community, something about opportunity, and something about responsibility, what type of a program would we write, if we were not concerned about who gets the credit?"

I would think that in that room perhaps they would look out over the history of our country and say, "All right, when Congress had that opportunity in the past, what type of programs did

Congress write?" I think they would think back to one of the most successful programs being the GI bill. The GI bill was based on a very simple premise; that was, people who served their country have an opportunity to get back something from their Government but that they got something from their Government because they had given something to their Government in the first place. That was what the GI bill was based on. It said to returning GI's who had served this country in the military that because of your service, your country is going to help you. We were going to help you go to the college of your choice. And as a result of that program, we gave literally hundreds of thousands of young Americans the opportunity to go to college, not because it was a handout, not because it was a grant, not because it was some sort of entitlement, but it was based on the theory that they had given something to their country and, therefore, their country was going to give them something back. And what we gave them was an opportunity for an education.

I would think then that the two Senators would say, "All right, let us see if we can now craft a program that builds on that GI bill, that concept that has served so many millions of Americans who have gone to college under the GI bill, let us see if we can craft a program that teaches young Americans something about responsibility, teaches them something about the communities that they live in, and something that also gives them an opportunity to better themselves. And, oh, by the way, let us make sure that program that we write will cost no more than one-thirtieth of 1 percent of our national budget."

That would be a real challenge. But I guarantee you, if the two Senators did not care who got the credit, they would come up with something that is very close to the National Service Program, the program known as AmeriCorps, which today is facing the prospect of being slashed and burned and killed before it has a chance to ever-present young Americans with opportunities, to teach them responsibility, and teach them something about their community.

Suppose people when we talked about the GI bill had said, "We are not going to do that. Let them go out and earn their own living, let them work. We are not going to have a GI program to help kids get to college. We don't care what their status is. We are not going to do that." How many young Americans would not have had the opportunity to be as successful as they are as a result of that program?

So what we have, I think, Mr. President, is a National Service Program that should be allowed to continue. It should be allowed to prosper. It should be allowed to flourish. What that program says to young Americans is that we are going to ask you to work in your community, not in a far-off coun-

try in another part of the world, although those services are needed, but we are going to ask you to work in your State, in your city, in your county. We are going to ask you to work with your local people who have identified what their problems are, what their concerns are, where they need help, if they need help in education, if they need help in police protection, if they need help in environmental clean-up programs, if they need help in health services for their local community. We are going to ask you to go back to your local community, and we are going to ask you to work in that local community. We are going to pay you a minimum wage stipend because we know you are not going to be able to do it if you do not have some form of assistance to allow you to feed yourself and clothe yourself and help you live your life.

We are going to pay you a minimum wage and ask you to do that, knowing that you could be making a lot more money in some other job, particularly if you have already graduated from college and are now paying back these loans. But in return, if you do that, we are going to help you go to college. We are going to help you with a grant to go to college based on the fact that you have worked in your community to make it a better place to live. That is the concept of reciprocal responsibility. That is saying to young men and women that your Government is going to help you if you give something back, if you give something back to your community and this country right here in America.

That is the whole essence of what the AmeriCorps Program is all about. It is not a giveaway program. It is not saying we are just going to give you money because that is what Government is all about and go to college because your Government is giving you something and asking nothing in return.

Those two Senators, who would not care about which party got the credit, would be very proud of this new direction, of this new partnership, of this new way of thinking, that says, yes.

We have programs that give grants to go to college. In most cases you have to show that you are poor. In most cases you have to go through a lot of paperwork to show that your parents do not have enough money. But this program will be based on the fact that we want to help anybody who believes enough in their country to believe in working in their local communities, assuming some responsibility at a time in their lives when that is very, very important, connecting that young person to their community in a way that perhaps they have never had the experience in doing before. And based on what they do, your Government will help you go to college with assistance. I would suggest that program would be one that we could all be very proud of.

We know, unfortunately, the problem is Congress sometimes gets involved

with who gets the credit, who gets the blame. I think a good program like this should have enough credit for everybody to take claim for it.

I was interested just the other day in reading an article by one of our Republican colleagues from the House. He said in talking about this program and the Republican effort to slash it and to kill it and to, in effect, terminate it, this Republican House Member said, "We have a wounded President." He further said that AmeriCorps "is something that this President deserves to be proud of, but it is a target for those people who do not even want to give him that."

I would suggest that is the real message that we are leaving on the floor today, not that this is not a good program, not that it does not teach a young person something about his own community or her own community, not that it does not teach them responsibility, that a government will help you if you do something. There is no free lunch. And I would not suggest they are not going to have it because it gives a young person opportunity by allowing them to have a college education. No. I would suggest that this House Member hit the nail on the head when he said that we have, in his opinion, a wounded President, this is a program that this President can and should be proud of, but that it is a target and it is a target not because of the merits; it is a target because of the politics. I would suggest that is not how we should legislate the future of young men and women in this country.

We have heard a lot of numbers thrown out on the floor today about how much the program cost. It is costing us one-thirtieth of 1 percent of our national budget.

Is that too little to invest in giving young men and women an opportunity, a sense of community, and teaching them about responsibility? I think not. In return for each full year of commitment, a 2-year maximum, a volunteer can receive \$4,725 in tuition assistance and health care and a stipend which is approximately the minimum wage.

So we pay young men and women a minimum wage to work in their local community doing things that are extremely important in that local community, and then, after they have done it, we say we will now help you with tuition for you to go to college.

I think that is a bargain. I think that is a new way of thinking about the role of individuals and their Government, that their Government is going to help them when they show responsibility and a willingness to contribute to their local community. I would suggest that is much better than just sending them the check and saying, "Well, we are the Government; here is the check; go to college."

What we are saying with this program is that we are going to help you if you do something in return. I think that makes a great deal of sense.

Some people say, "Well, if you pay someone a minimum wage, they are not a volunteer." The former distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia, SAM NUNN, my good friend, almost laughed at that suggestion because we all know now we have a volunteer army. Does anybody suggest it is not voluntary anymore because we pay them a salary? Of course, not. We pay everybody who volunteers in the military. We pay them more than a minimum wage. We pay them a livable salary. But the whole military is voluntary now. No one is drafted. No one is required to serve. It is an All-Volunteer Army, and yet we still pay men and women who voluntarily join the military.

So I would suggest that paying a young person a minimum wage stipend in order to work in their local community does not detract from the fact that this is a voluntary program. Many of these young graduates who return to work in their local communities are voluntarily doing it. They could earn a great deal more if they would go right into the private sector at a high-wage job. But, no, they are saying this is what I wish to do. This is a way to pay back my Government for what it has done for me. It is still clearly a voluntary program.

I do not understand why we are arguing about this. Some of the polls that I have seen say that over 90 percent of the American public, when they are explained in a rational and reasonable tone what the national service program is all about, say this is a good idea; why did we not think of it before? Why do we only have grants coming out of Washington that you have to go through weeks and months of paperwork to make sure you have the right income level to finally qualify? Why not say to all Americans we are going to help you if you are willing to serve in your community?

That is the essence of what national service is all about. That is the essence of what AmeriCorps is all about. The Peace Corps was a successful program. We sent men and women from our country to far-off lands to help improve conditions in those far-off countries and people thought it was a good idea. It was and it still is.

Here is a Peace Corps Program for our own country to help urban areas, to help rural areas, to help local officials who desperately need young, talented, future leaders of this country working in their communities. I think the beautiful thing about it is that it is a partnership, it is a reciprocal partnership between you and your Government to help people quit thinking the Government owes them something, that just because they are born the Government owes them something and is going to pay for it. It is a partnership.

Again, if I could have those two Senators who did not care whether they were Republican or Democrat, who did

not care that this was Bill Clinton's idea, I guarantee they could walk out of that room and say we thought of something that really makes sense. Let us make sense.

Is it perfect? Of course, not. Nothing is perfect. Are there some examples of how things should not have been done? Of course. But the program is in its infancy stage. Let us let it breathe for a few years to try to get it on track. If there are some problems with it, let us fix the problems and make sure they do not occur again. But do not kill the program. Do not say to the young men and women of America, we are going to continue to try and teach you there is something like a free lunch, because this program is just the opposite. This program says you will get from your Government help and assistance when you agree to give something back.

Funding was \$575 million for fiscal year 1995, one-thirtieth of 1 percent of our budget. Can we not invest one-thirtieth of 1 percent in the lives of future Americans, young men and women who want to learn about community, who want to learn about responsibility, who want to have opportunity given to them for what they have invested?

I think that is a wise expenditure of tax dollars. I think we are going to see great dividends paid, maybe not right now but in future years; that when somebody sits back and compares some of the good programs that Congress has done they will point to the GI bill as one of our most wonderful programs, but at that time, if we are successful, they can also say that when Congress had the opportunity in the 1990's they built on the GI bill and passed a national service program, and now, maybe 10, 20 years later, it is producing the results we would like to see.

Mr. President, I will be offering an amendment to help restore some of the draconian cuts that were passed by the House on this program. My amendment would allow for still a 20-percent reduction in the spending from last year. Most programs come in and say we need more money, more money, more money. My amendment is going to say, all right, in this time of fiscal balance and concern about deficits, let us reduce last year's spending by 20 percent even though we have more money and more requests than we did before. Let us reduce by 20 percent the President's request for the National Service Program, but let us keep it viable. Let us keep it working. Let us keep the innovative ideas that are coming out of that program so that we can say, when we had the opportunity to teach our young men and women in this country the things that are needed in order to make this country great, we stood up and were counted and voted in favor of my amendment.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 16 minutes and 7 seconds.

Mr. BREAUX. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the minority leader's time.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Daschle amendment. This amendment is essential to restore funding for critical national education and children's needs that were disproportionately targeted for reduction in the rescission bill.

Last week, the Children's Defense Fund released its annual report, "The State of America's Children." CDF reports that child poverty has reached its highest level in more than 30 years. Last year, one in every four children in our Nation was poor.

CDF reports:

An American child is reported abused or neglected every 11 seconds; is born into poverty every 32 seconds; is born to a teen mother every 62 seconds; is arrested for a violent crime every four minutes; and is killed by guns every two hours.

Mr. President, no great nation can long survive if it does not provide adequately for its children. I know of none of my colleagues who would disagree with this statement. But, I know of too many who are prepared to violate its spirit by reducing funding for proven and vital programs, by slashing welfare programs to save money, and by elimination the safety net that protects American families.

The rescission bill before us today contains \$13 billion in cuts in Federal programs. Overall, this is a much better bill than the one that passed the House. But, nonetheless, a large and disproportionate share of these cuts are targeted at programs that benefit children and youth.

CHILDREN

This bill contains a 20-percent reduction in the President's investment programs. That reduction translates into a \$42 million cut in Head Start.

Mr. President, last year I authored the Human Services Act that reauthorized the Head Start Program. At the time, I was prepared for a real challenge and a spirited defense of the legislation on the floor. Instead the legislation passed unanimously with no dissension and no acrimony. Head Start is a proven program that gives disadvantaged youngsters an early and important step forward in their educational development—yet this rescission bill goes after it.

The bill before us also includes an \$8.4 million cut in the child care and development block grant. Currently, eight States have more than 10,000 children on child care assistance waiting lines. And many more child care slots will be needed as we seek to move people from welfare to work.

The Women, Infants, and Children's Program takes a \$35 million hit in this bill. WIC has always been a popular and bipartisan program. The program is a wise investment providing nutritional assistance to low-income pregnant women and children. It saves money and lives in the process. Last year, I

joined with 70 of my colleagues in requesting full funding for this vital program.

The Daschle amendment would restore the cuts in these three important programs, and it would pare back cuts in education.

EDUCATION

Today, our Nation faces tremendous and unparalleled economic challenges. Increased global economic competition and rapid advances in technology have created major structural changes in our work force.

If we are to meet the economic challenges of the 21st century, it is critical that we invest in the education and training of our work force—even if it takes us a little longer to get our budget fully into balance.

Yet at precisely the time in our Nation's history when our educational challenges are greatest, the Federal commitment to education has diminished. Since 1979, we have cut in half the Federal commitment to elementary and secondary Education to a share of total education spending. This decrease has exacerbated the disparities in education spending across school districts and threatens to compromise our future economic productivity.

Education takes a heavy hit in this bill. It includes a \$100 million cut in the only Federal program that seeks to combat violence and drug abuse in our schools—the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

It includes a \$72 million cut in the title one program for disadvantaged children. It includes a \$68 million cut in the Goals 2000 Program. This cut would deny seed money for implementing comprehensive reform plans to about 1,550 schools.

The Daschle amendment recognizes that these shortsighted cuts cost our Nation more in the long-run than they save today.

HOUSING

The largest cuts in the rescission bill occur in Federal housing programs. The rescission bill includes more than \$4.5 billion in cuts in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's current budget. If enacted, these cuts will hurt low-income people struggling to find decent housing and reduce economic opportunity in our urban communities. Forty percent of public housing residents are single women with children.

Even without the recommended rescissions, current funding levels for HUD's public and assisted housing programs serve only about a third of the persons eligible for benefits. In Connecticut, there continues to be a shortage of affordable housing. There are 15,000 homeless people in my State, including more than 3,000 children.

The Daschle amendment would restore \$500 million to the public housing modernization account. These funds are critical for families living in public housing. Without them, we will have more roofs with holes, rusting stair-

wells, and boarded-up windows. Unless we restore these funds, thousands of families will be forced to raise their children in substandard housing.

The Daschle amendment is essential to help us maintain decent living conditions at many public housing developments across the country.

NATIONAL SERVICE

The rescission bill cuts national service by \$210 million. The AmeriCorps Program has provided thousands of Americans with the opportunity to serve in their communities and earn a post-service benefit for further education and training. Currently, 20,000 young Americans have answered this call to service and are working in communities across the country to meet vital needs. The AmeriCorps Program represents all that is best about America. The Daschle amendment recognizes this fact and restores funding for this program.

CONCLUSION

After consulting with high-paid political pollsters, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have begun cloaking their political goals in the guise of helping kids.

They have learned to talk about deficit reduction in terms of its impact on our children's future prosperity. And they have learned to talk about tax cuts in terms of their impact on families with young children.

They've become better at framing issues to score quick political points and worse at thoughtfully examining the impact of their policies.

Clearly it is important that we reduce our deficit and our debt. But a child who is denied food on the table, adequate child care, or a decent education is not worried about what may happen to them 20 or 30 years down the road. They are worried about their health and safety in the present. And we should be too.

The cuts in this bill compromise the immediate nutrition, housing, and developmental needs of thousands of our children. The Daschle amendment lessens the severity of these cuts.

The Children Defense Fund's report should powerfully focus our resolve to strengthen our investment in children's needs, not to lessen them.

I urge my colleagues not to undermine our commitment to our kids. I urge my colleagues to support the Daschle amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields back the time.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH. I yield back the remainder of the time on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields back the remainder of the time.

Mr. BREAUX addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

RINGLING BROS. AND BARNUM & BAILEY CIRCUS ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules

Committee be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 34 relative to the Ringling Bros. Circus and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration under the following time agreement: 1 hour under the control of Senator SMITH to offer an amendment regarding elephants. I further ask that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on the Smith amendment, to be followed immediately by a vote on adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus Anniversary Commemoration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that the resolution that we have before us is a resolution to allow the Ringling Bros. Circus to come on the Capitol Grounds at some point this next week. I believe it is Wednesday. I could be wrong on the date.

As a youngster, I enjoyed the circus many times, as most of us have. I have no objection to many of the acts that you see in the circus. My objection here to this resolution is the issue of using elephants in a way that they are used in the circuses throughout the United States, in this case Ringling Bros., because they are planning to bring, I cannot get the exact number, a certain number of adult elephants onto the Capitol Grounds.

AMENDMENT NO. 449

(Purpose: To prevent the use of elephants in the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus celebration)

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am going to offer an amendment, and that amendment should be at the desk. I will offer that amendment at this time, an amendment to the underlying resolution. It is a very simple amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] proposes an amendment numbered 449.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 9 through 13, and insert the following: "performers, on the Capitol Grounds, on April 3, 1995, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

No elephants shall be allowed on the Capitol Grounds for the purpose of this event."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the amendment is a very simple amendment. It simply says the circus can proceed on the Capitol Grounds without the use of elephants.

Now, this is the type of amendment that tends to bring some ridicule of me by others who have in some way expressed their concern about this. I am going to go through this because I think it needs to be said. I am going to be very methodical about it.

It concerns two areas. One area is how the elephant in a circus is treated; not how you see the elephant out there doing its performance, but how it is treated in order to do that performance, and how it is kept, how it is transported. And, second, I am going to outline a number of incidents that have taken place in the past few years involving these huge, several-thousand-pound animals that are used in the circus.

I am not going to in any way try to misrepresent facts. I realize—and I want to say it up front—that in some areas the Ringling Bros. people do some very fine things with animals. I know for a fact that one of the trainers at Ringling Bros. who trains dogs saves some of those dogs from death at the pound and trains those animals to be used in the act. I do not object to any of that.

This involves elephants.

I hope that the cameras can pick this up, but this, in only a very small way, conveys the horror of what I am talking about, because I cannot explain it or show it with pictures. I have films. I have tried for about 2 weeks now to interest any of my colleagues, any one of my colleagues—any one—in this issue, to no avail.

So that all my colleagues will know, lest they be worried about it, I have decided not to call for a rollcall vote on this issue, because I know what the vote will be. It will be a voice vote.

But I want my colleagues to know that what they are doing by allowing these animals on the Capitol Grounds is a grave risk, a grave risk not only to the animals but also to the children who have been invited to be here.

This elephant in this picture here was shot over 100 times when it went berserk in Honolulu. It killed a trainer and injured some people.

These animals—you might say, what is it about them that would cause them to do this? Well, for those who care, I would think that they must not have reacted too well to some of the training and some of the things that they are required to do in these acts.

Now, does this mean that deliberately people try to inflict harm upon these animals? In some cases, that may be true. Are they fed well? Of course, they are fed well. But that is not the issue here. The issue is, should an animal this big go through the procedures that we put them through, and is it

safe to have them around little children on the Capitol Grounds?

Now, I want to again repeat, I do not object to Ringling Bros. being here. I know they do a lot of things in the breeding of elephants and help to somehow enhance some species that may even be on the endangered species list.

That is not what I object to. I object to them being transported and used in the way they are used.

I have a film of this animal from beginning to end. I have asked some of my colleagues to look at it. Nobody has taken me up on it. Maybe if they took me up on it, somebody might come down on the floor and ask for a recorded vote. It would be nice to have a little company.

But let me start by relaying some incidents. Because, bear in mind, now, sometime this week, or whenever we do it—I would like to be wrong on the number and I stand corrected if I am—but somewhere around 15 elephants are going to be brought onto the Capitol Grounds. Maybe it is less. I do not know how many it will be. I have not been told. I cannot find out. So many elephants are going to be brought on the Capitol Grounds here.

How do you restrain an elephant?

So they are going to be brought on to the Capitol Grounds. As we hear about these elephants being brought on the Capitol Grounds here, remember this is my objection.

Let us talk about some of the things that happened to elephants in circuses in the last few years. Let us just take a few minutes and go through them.

I have talked to Mr. Ireland, who is a representative of the Ringling Bros. Circus. We had a very nice conversation. He is a good friend of mine; a former Congressman. He represents Ringling Bros. He came in and spoke to me. He made a very strong case, a good appeal to me.

I ask him if he would simply remove the elephants from the act on the Capitol Grounds. This circus is going to be performing downtown in the armory for 20 days. All I ask is that the elephants be removed from the acts on the Capitol Grounds, because I thought first, it was a danger; and second, I objected to some of the ways and methods that were used to train these animals, to no avail. There was no agreement. They would not agree to do that.

I cannot understand why it is so important to have these huge animals roaming around the Capitol Grounds. If people want to see them, they can go down the street at the armory, go to the circus and see them there. But they said that was out of the question. They would not agree. So here I am.

It is an issue of public safety, Mr. President. It really is an issue of public safety.

Now, it would be very easy for the skeptics, because, after it is all over, if nothing happened—and I pray to God nothing does; but if it does, then do not say I did not tell you so—and if it does not—and I hope it does not—they will

all say, "Well, there was SMITH out there wailing away on nothing. It is irrelevant. He took the Senate's time. Nobody cares about this."

Well, at least 15 people have been killed by animals in the last 5 years in circuses—15 people. And I am going to go through these right now.

This one here, 2 weeks ago, a circus elephant trampled two men to death in Bangkok. OK, that was not in America. OK; fine. I am preparing myself for the comments that will be coming. So let us move on.

Ringling Bros.—that is who we are talking about here; that is who is coming to town, Ringling Bros.—Ringling Bros. Circus' most experienced trainer, Alex Gautier, was trampled to death in 1993.

Lest somebody would doubt me, I have the obituary on that somewhere. Let me see if I can find it. I have it right here.

This is an obituary from the New York Times. He was Ringling Bros.' elephant trainer. He was trampled to death 2 years ago by an elephant. He had been with Ringling for 35 years. So it was not exactly some inexperienced kid that came out and said, "I'm going to train an elephant." He represents 35 years of training.

Even if Ringling's most experienced trainers are at risk, how about the kids on the Capitol Grounds? Does anybody care about them? Hundreds of schoolchildren are going to be here.

I heard Speaker GINGRICH say how wonderful it was going to be; we are going to have animals on the grounds; it was going to be a wonderful thing for the children.

A 51-year-old elephant trainer, leading trainer of elephants, performer all these years, died 2 years ago at a hospital at the University of Florida, Gainesville. One of the elephants he was working with at the Ringling Bros. elephant farm in Williston, FL, knocked him down and stepped on him. He was taken by helicopter to the hospital. He was a feature performer at one of the show's traveling circuses where he had been appearing in Asheville, NC. He was making a brief visit to the farm to check on the conservation and breeding program in the herd of 20 elephants.

So that is the first instance.

In 1994, Alan Campbell was crushed to death and a dozen spectators—a dozen spectators—were injured when an elephant with Circus International went on a rampage through downtown Honolulu. This is that picture. That elephant killed the trainer, came out of the little circle, the arena, came out of the tent, through a fence, out into the road. There was absolutely no protection for the people against this huge animal.

They had to shoot this animal with anything they could find—revolvers, whatever they could gear up; there was absolutely no protection—100 times before the animal fell down against a car, and even then they could not kill it

with a gun. Somebody got there with some type of drug and was able to immobilize the elephant for when they finally killed it. So 100 times. It was the second incident at the circus in 1 week.

Was that Ringling? No. I am not maintaining that it is. It was a circus and that happened. Elephants are elephants. I do not think elephants know the difference between a Ringling Bros. Circus and any other circus. If they are asked to stand up on one leg on a barrel, I do not think they understand if it is Ringling asking them to do it or anybody else.

If anybody can tell me how they know that, I would be happy to hear it.

Backstage at "Live with Regis and Kathie Lee," Yelena Aleynikova had her skull fractured, ribs broken and a lung punctured by a Moscow Circus elephant in 1994. She is suing the circus, the show, and ABC as a result of that incident.

I hope our insurance is paid up on the Capitol Grounds, by the way.

Schoolchildren looked on as an elephant crushed a man to death at the San Salvador National Zoo in 1993. He was the second person that this very elephant had killed.

Char-Lee Torre was kicked to death by an elephant at the Lowry Park Zoo in Florida in 1993.

Christopher Ponte was crushed to death in 1993 by an elephant at the Clyde Beatty-Cole Bros. Circus in New York.

And in 1992, Jubal Cox was grabbed and slammed to death by an elephant in Texas while visiting the San Antonio Zoo.

There is more.

Eight children and their parents were pinned under a fence by an elephant at the Circus International in 1994—children.

Twelve spectators were injured and a police officer was thrown to the ground when an elephant went on a rampage in Florida at the Great American Circus in 1992. The elephant was shot and killed by police.

Again, members of the audience were trampled after an elephant at Circus Benneweis attacked her trainer and went running through the town's busy harbor area in 1994. The elephant later returned and was killed.

In 1994 in Utah, Jordan Circus animal trainer Rex Williams suffered broken ribs, a broken arm and organ damage after being thrown and trampled by an elephant on whom children—children—were riding.

Here is a Ringling animal trainer, George Lewis:

An elephant, when brought into captivity, must make a tremendous adjustment to live with man . . . They come to hate their human masters, who are responsible for keeping them confined . . .

That is a Ringling trainer.

I do not have them all up here on the chart, but let me give you a couple more.

On August 15, 1994, 10 people were injured when an elephant pinned them

under a fence separating the ring from the audience in Honolulu, HI.

Lion Country Safari: On February 1, 1992, 12 people were injured, including one police officer, when an Indian elephant broke loose during a performance at Brevard Community College in Palm Bay, FL.

On June 8, 1990, a man was injured when an elephant attacked her trainer and ran into a crowd in Reading, PA. The trainer had repeatedly stuck the elephant in the mouth with a hook to gain her attention just prior to the attack. The trainer got her attention, I might add.

In July 1987, two children were injured in Milwaukee, WI, by an elephant when she escaped from trainers with children on her back. The circus recovered the animal and she resumed giving children rides 2 days later. I wonder if the parents of the children who were brought to ride the elephant after the incident were told the animal had done that days before.

Hanneford Family Circus: On June 21, 1990, David Dickerson, an elephant trainer, was killed when the elephant he was training crushed him after being startled by a passing car in Fort Lauderdale, FL.

Commefford & Sons: On August 31, 1991, Brian Corring was severely injured by an elephant carrying children on her back during the Champlain Valley Fair in Essex Junction, VT. While the children on the elephant were unharmed, the parents felt the officials ignored the severity of the situation. This was the second time that the elephant had injured someone.

Just a couple more.

The Gatini Circus: Elephant trainer Eloise Berchtold was killed by an elephant during a performance at Rock Forest, Quebec. The elephant stepped on Berchtold and would not let anyone near her to provide medical assistance.

Tarzan Zerbini International Circus: July 15, 1992, nine people were injured when elephants toppled a barricade during a performance at a shopping center in Lafayette, IN.

I have been trying for the past several days to get somebody around this place to care about this, and I cannot do it. I cannot find anybody that cares. There is not exactly a crowd on the Senate floor right now.

I asked the Sergeant at Arms how much does it cost for the extra security, extra police—just the extra police, not what it costs us every day. The extra police, just for a couple of hours while the circus is here for overtime—overtime for officers—\$52,000.

I then said to the Sergeant at Arms, "I want to know what protection do we have for the children and the spectators on the Capitol Grounds if this elephant, or any elephant of the elephants you have on the grounds, goes berserk, what do we do?"

He said to my staff person, "I will not tell you that. I will not tell you what the protection is." The implication is that it would be a security mat-

ter, and I respect that. But I am a U.S. Senator. The last time I looked, the Sergeant at Arms worked for us. Maybe somebody else has a different perspective on that. I thought the Sergeant at Arms worked for the Senate.

I am a Senator, and I asked him, "What do we have available to us if an elephant goes berserk on the Capitol Grounds?" He refused to tell me. He refused to tell me. He did not say, "I'll put it off," "I'll tell you tomorrow," "I'll look it up," or "It is the following." He said, "I won't tell you," period. "I don't have to tell you, and I won't." And he did not, and I do not know why. I assume 99 of my other colleagues do not care. They are just going to have the elephants here.

I was told by the office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms that the security requirements for this circus for 2 hours would be the equivalent of the State of the Union Address. So, apparently, they must think it is pretty serious.

We were also told that the cost was mainly associated with the expected demonstrations against the involvement of the elephants in the circus. Of course, the elephants themselves pose a serious security threat and, thus, an enormous cost to the taxpayers in excess security personnel, but I cannot find out what the security is.

It is my understanding that all shifts of the Capitol Police—all—will be on duty during this event when they bring the circus to town. The Senate Sergeant at Arms told me it would require paying overtime for a number of officers—again, \$52,000.

Let us go into it a little bit more because sometimes when you talk about money around here, it is the only time you get anybody's attention.

If a person does not care about the elephants, and they do not care about the kids out there, maybe we can get your attention with money. Of course, that is not including the regular Capitol Police officers who will be on hand, that is \$200,000, in addition to the \$52,000. If there are any arrests, any at all, anybody gets arrested out there—protesting, demonstrating, making love, whatever they are doing out there on the grounds—each arrest will cost additional overtime hours on top of the \$52,000. This does not include the additional security costs for the Washington, DC Police Department. It also does not include the setup costs of the circus. The Architect of the Capitol estimates that could be about \$7,000. Remember now, the circus is right downtown for 20 days.

Mr. President, for the past several days we have been debating decisions of previously appropriated funds. It is not an easy task, because many of the projects are worthy. These programs will be paid for. These programs we have been debating on the floor of the Senate will be paid for by our children and their children.

Ringling Bros. said the elephants must be in the circus, cannot have a circus without elephants. I asked if

they would bring the circus here so I could come and enjoy it as well, without the elephants. Clowns, acrobats, dancing dogs. No, no, no, they want to see that, but the kids want to see the elephants.

Well, I hope the kids enjoy it because they are paying for it. Right now the national debt says each child in America today is \$18,500 in debt, so we will add to your debt. So I hope you enjoy the elephants. We will pay for it years from now. They will pay when they join the work force. By then, the national debt will be—I do not know what it will be by that time. It will be \$6 trillion by the next 3 or 4 years.

So, I suppose I could say if I was cynical, if we want to cut the cost of Government, we could vote for this amendment. If we pass the amendment, there will be no protesters, there will be no threat of elephants running amok on the Capitol Grounds. And we can pass it by unanimous consent. We save the taxpayers \$52,000.

There are all sorts of events on the Mall here in Washington. Cirque du Soleil has done performances on the Mall. No elephants, no protests, no threat to security, no cost to taxpayers. The kids loved it. They do not need elephants to have a good time. Neither does Ringling.

Ringling Bros. circus is performing at the armory. If the kids really want elephants, they can go and see them at the armory or they can see them at the National Zoo. They can see them for free at the National Zoo. There are several there, as a matter of fact, for the benefit of anybody who might be listening who cares, including a baby elephant.

They are not asked to stand on their heads or climb up on a barrel about the size of 1 foot, parade around with a hook in their mouths. They are just there, well-taken care of at the zoo.

So, let me again comment on the Sergeant at Arms, because this is very critical. I think there is an arrogance here, No. 1. We have a right to know. A U.S. Senator asked the Sergeant at Arms about information about an event here on the Capitol Grounds. We have a right to know what it is. I will find out. With or without a vote on this amendment, I will find out what they are going to do and what the plan is.

I asked, and the only reason I have not found out, I was not here, and I had to have a staff person do it on my behalf. I will find out or there will be hell to pay as to why I do not find out.

Given all the instances I have mentioned that is not an unreasonable concern. What do they have on the grounds. How do we stop an elephant, Mr. President, if it goes berserk? What do we do? Do you use an AK-47? An M-16? An AR-15? They are illegal in Washington. A person cannot even carry them. All illegal. All banned. This is gun control in the city of Washington. Highest crime rate in the world, we have gun control. All illegal.

Frankly, would that stop an elephant? I doubt it. I really doubt it. Do

they have a bazooka? What is their plan of action? What is the plan if something happens? It took 100 rounds in this poor animal here that went wild in Honolulu and that still didn't kill it. It needed to be killed by lethal injection.

People ought to see the film. My colleagues ought to look at the film of that. That is really something to watch. Look at the policemen, and then see if you can vote against this. I do not know where we will get 100 rounds. Last year's crime bill banned the manufacture, sale, or possession of all clips over 10 rounds, so I assume we will have 100 officers standing out there with pistols, with 10 rounds in a clip. I do not know. I cannot find out.

Now, do we want to be firing AK-47 rounds around little children if something happens? I do not know. These are the issues that ought to be of concern.

Overreacting, they will say. Yes, always overreacting until something happens. Is that not the way it is?

Even those who do not have strong feelings about the treatment of animals ought to be concerned about the issue of public safety, as well as the cost.

I want to stress a few points in closing here. Ringling Bros. maintains their training practices are not cruel and they are not abusive. I think they mean that. They may think that.

But let me say when the elephants go berserk the first person they go after is the trainer. That ought to say something. When I met with Mr. Ireland he said that while Ringling Bros. does, in fact, use whips, whips are used because of the cracking sound, which is an audible cue to the elephants.

I am not an elephant trainer. I do not know what the function of a whip is or how it works. I suppose if someone was whipping a cracking whip behind me I would probably do whatever they said, too.

I have concerns about a number of other practices that are regularly employed in the training of elephants. I am not going to get into whether Ringling employs these are not. I do not know. We may never know, because no outside organizations are allowed to monitor or film their trainers.

I was offered the opportunity to go down to a Ringling training area where they train elephants by Ringling. They said, "You can come in and watch us train." I found that somewhat humorous. If they had any methods I would object to, I do not think they would use them while I was there. Maybe they would, but I doubt it.

So, let me mention a few articles that I have here.

Before I do, let me call my colleagues' attention to a section of the National Geographic. This piece from the National Geographic shows the methods that are used. Obviously, I cannot show it here. We do not have the facilities to do that. Might be a good thing to do some time.

These tapes, I have them. I will be more than happy to provide them for my colleagues to look at, anytime they want to look at them. The hooks that are used, the methods of training the animals down, the cramped quarters to house the animals, and the methods used in breaking wild elephants.

Let me just say for the record on wild elephants, Ringling has assured me they do not use wild elephants, that they breed their own and take young elephants, and I have no reason to deny that.

In the past, and, in fact, in some other circuses, baby elephants are captured in the wild, taken from their mother, and beaten for days at a time while they are screaming. It is on the tape. Members ought to watch it. Beaten, for days and days, in shifts, by these people in the jungles of Thailand and Laos. Wherever the elephants are captured, beaten consistently until their spirit is broken, and until they have nothing left to offer resistance to. Screaming and crying. Ought to watch the tape.

Does Ringling do that? No, I want to make it clear. But young elephants are captured and are used in circuses in that way.

Now, the issue, we could go on and on and on. Elephant incident after incident after incident, where elephants have been on the rampage and done some of these things.

The issue, really, is this. Should an animal this big, this wild, be used for entertainment? I do not think so. I do not see the need for it. There is no need for it. We do not see what happens when the circus is not around. When we are not watching the circus.

We are seeing the animal out there with his trunk around another elephant's tail and gets up and does a trick. That looks cute and I have seen it.

Frankly, before I knew more about this I thought it was great. How do they transport an elephant from Florida to California? You cannot put them on an airplane, so they put them in some kind of a truck. Ever look at the width of a highway? There is only so much size of a truck that can be used.

So they are in cramped quarters. Now, when you have them on location for a circus—let us say down here at the Armory—how do you restrain these animals? How do you restrain an animal that weighs several tons? Let me tell you how you restrain them. You chain them. You chain them up.

You can say we feed them hay, we feed them grain, we take good care of them—these are wild animals. So that is why things like this happen. That is why elephants go berserk, because they are not meant to do these kinds of things and it is cruel. It is cruel.

We have an opportunity here today in the Senate to make a very small statement. We are not going to stop this by doing this. We are not going to

stop it. But we could say, as U.S. Senators and U.S. Congressmen, that we do not want to risk having an incident like this happen on the Capitol Grounds, No. 1; and, No. 2, we think that, even though it is not intended to be cruel, the result is that it is cruel in the way that we treat these animals. They ought to be left alone in zoos, in parks, wherever we can; and not use—or abuse—them in the ways that is being done in these circuses.

The little kids ought to be able to go down and see these elephants chained and restricted, or watch the training, which we are not allowed to watch.

I think it is sad because all we have to do is just make a statement: No, we are not going to let the elephants come here on the Capitol Grounds because we do not think it is right. The elephants are still going to be performing down at the Armory. We are not going to be able to stop that. But we make a statement and maybe, by making that statement, we show the world and show the country that we care a little bit.

I know the types of criticism and the ridicule that I get. People say you are an animal rights nut. I am not. I am not. But they do not have anybody. There is nobody who can come out here on the floor. An elephant cannot come out here on the floor. No animal can come out here. It does not have any Congressmen or Senators to represent it. So if somebody does not speak up, who do they have?

So it is a very small thing to do, really. It is not a big deal. We just say Ringling, come on up; bring the clowns, bring the dog acts, bring the rings, bring the trapeze artists, and entertain the kids. But leave the elephants in the zoos and in the parks. Leave them alone.

Circuses started back in the days when we did not understand this, or when we did not care. Those days are past. Let us move on. Let us get into the 21st century here.

Elephants are a vanishing species, anyway. I doubt very much 100 years from now, when somebody stands here at Daniel Webster's desk where I stand now, I seriously doubt that person is going to know what a live elephant looks like. Unfortunately, I have to say that.

In some cases, some of these groups like Ringling do a good deed by breeding these animals. But you do not have to use them in circus acts, which are unnatural for these animals. That is why these incidents happen.

We have another quote here:

Physical abuse and dominance control remain a major method of training elephants.

That is by John Lehnhardt, the assistant curator at the National Zoo right here in Washington. These guys know what they are talking about. Do not take my word for it. These are people who work with these animals every day. They know what they are talking about. It is unnatural to make huge beasts the size of an elephant do the things we ask them to do. They are telling us that. They are warning us.

Henry Ringling North, the Ringling Circus founder, said:

When it came to teaching [the animals] the more involved tricks, [Ringling animal trainer Alfred Court] had to use a whip. If an animal got out of line, he flicked that animal in the most sensitive place you could hit either a male or a female. He hit, but only because the animal had made a mistake.

Really? That is what the kids are going to patronize when they come on the Capitol Grounds.

Let me just repeat, Mr. President, when I started this process I said if I get some support, if I get some people who will come forth and participate in this debate with me and share my concern, I would probably call for a rollcall vote. But it did not come. I know where the votes are and are not. There is no point in taking the Senate's time anymore on this. I will not call for a rollcall vote.

I will call for a vote, however, at whatever time the Senate wishes to have it, either now or tomorrow. Unless someone else asks for a recorded vote, I will call for a voice vote on this matter and, if the wishes of the Senate are that it be now, in just a moment, I will do that by yielding the floor.

Let me remind my colleagues, before I yield back the remainder of my time, of all the materials that back this up. This is not the only incident. There are many incidents like this. I will say again, in summary, I hope nothing happens. But I also say we are not prepared for it if it does. We are not prepared to handle a rampaging elephant with a bunch of little schoolchildren out on the Capitol Grounds. If we are prepared for it—and the Sergeant at Arms refuses to tell me whether we are or not—if we are, it would have to be with some humongous weapon, which would have to impose a danger on the children who would be here, because we do not know what direction this elephant would run, or any elephant would run, or elephants, if they were to do that, if they would be so inclined to do it.

I have made my case. I think I have told the world, the Senate, and hopefully many families and children out there who may want to be coming to the circus—I hope, frankly, you do not. I hope you send a statement that this is wrong and we ought not to do it and we ought to be somewhat considerate, in a very small way, by saying this is wrong.

Mr. President, at this time, regretfully, I yield the floor without requesting a recorded vote. At this time, I yield the remainder of—I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAU. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. I do not doubt in any way the sincerity of the Senator from New Hampshire in his beliefs and strong feelings on this subject. I will only make two very brief points.

First, we already have on the books rules and regulations that govern the handling of wild animals and, indeed, all animals that appear in circuses: How they are treated, how they are transported, how they are fed, how they are cared for, how they are treated when they are sick. Those rules and regulations are already on the books. If indeed those rules are deficient, the appropriate committees in the Congress of the United States should review those rules and then make recommendations to the full body. None of that has been done in this case.

Second, I trust the Sergeant at Arms, whom I know the Senator from New Hampshire knows very well. I am certain he has reviewed the risks and lack of risks associated with the appearance of a portion of Ringling Bros. Circus on the Capitol Grounds. He, indeed, has the responsibility of determining whether events can take place on the Capitol Grounds that do not impair the safety of the Members of this body, as well as the employees who work here, as well as, in fact, the physical grounds that constitute the Capitol of the United States. I trust, I am certain he has made a decision that these events can take place without putting any person at risk, any Members at risk or, indeed, any of the physical structures of the Capitol at risk.

Therefore, Mr. President and colleagues, I think the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, in good faith and with all sincerity—I admire the work he has put into this—I suggest is inappropriate at this time and ask for its defeat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If all time is yielded, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment (No. 449) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the House Concurrent Resolution 34.

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESCINDING \$230 MILLIONS IN MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last month the Senate debated the Defense supplemental appropriations bill. Although I supported this legislation, I expressed my dismay that the Appropriations Committee chose to fully offset the \$1.9 billion supplemental from the fiscal year 1995 Defense budget. In a practical sense, that action cut the

Defense budget by almost \$2.0 billion at a time when the readiness levels of our Armed Forces are teetering on the edge.

Since 1985, the Defense budget has decreased by 40 percent in buying power. The 1995 Defense budget, which is being used to fund the Administration's ill-conceived foreign ventures, has already been reduced by \$40 billion below the 1990 budget even without the reduction in purchasing power from inflation. Today, with this supplemental, we add insult to injury by further cutting the 1995 Defense budget to fund domestic programs.

The committee's amendment to H.R. 1158 further reduces the already constrained Defense budget by over \$200 million, including the \$104 million in critical base closure funds, \$27 million for projects to meet environmental responsibilities at our overseas base, and \$69 million for NATO infrastructure funding.

I must point out the irony here, in the committee's attempt to reduce funding, it may actually be increasing the cost to the Department by rescinding the NATO funds. I am advised that these funds have all been obligated and this rescission may require breaking contracts and therefore incurring additional costs.

Possibly the most damaging effect this supplemental will have is on base closure. The recommendation to further cut the base closure account at a time when the Base Closure Commission is reviewing recommendations to add more bases to the closure list is, in my judgement, misguided.

It does not make sense to reduce funds critical for the closing and cleaning up of bases—funds that are used to pay civilian severance, environmental restoration, and the civilian and military relocation costs associated with closing a base. These cuts, proposed by the Appropriations Committee, will not only delay the closure process, they will negatively impact communities that are desperately looking for alternative uses for these bases to speed up their economic recovery. Just last year, Congress rescinded \$507 million in this same account and caused havoc to the closure process and our communities which are still trying to recover from the cuts.

I have an amendment prepared to offer which will restore the funding for the base closure account. However, in order not to delay this process any longer, and after conferring with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction who assured me he would consider restoring the funds during the joint conference on the bill, I will not offer the amendment.

Mr. President, let me close by stating that reducing the Defense budget every time there is an unexpected defense or domestic need requiring a supplemental is not a sustainable policy over the long term, nor is such a policy in the interest of our national security. The men and women of our Armed

Forces expect better from the Senate. These dedicated individuals, who risk their lives daily and endure long separations from their families, have earned our support. I am committed to providing that support and hope my colleagues in the Senate and on the Appropriations Committee will join me in stopping this erosion to the Defense budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to me dated March 10, 1995, from John Deutch, Deputy Secretary of Defense, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, March 30, 1995.
Senator STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to request your assistance in resisting the proposed rescission of \$230 million in the fiscal year 1995 Military Construction appropriation.

The Senate proposed rescission of \$104 million for the Base Closure and Realignment Account (BRAC) impacts the Department of Defense's ability to implement the base closures as mandated by law. The Department makes every effort to minimize the impact on communities. The ability to close as expeditiously as possible not only saves the federal government money that we have counted on, but also provides the communities with early opportunities for economic development and job creation. Our experience with the fiscal year 1994 rescission was that it severely impacted both Service and community closure efforts.

The proposed \$69 million rescission of NATO funds is of significant concern. These funds are currently obligated and any rescission would incur additional costs for contract terminations of ongoing construction projects. It also sends a very negative signal concerning our support for the NATO Alliance.

The proposed overseas reductions of \$27 million primarily affect our ability to meet our environmental responsibilities. The worldwide unspecified reduction of \$30 million places a burden on the Services to find alternative sources of funds for needed projects. We already face a \$137 million unallocated reduction in the fiscal year 1995 appropriation.

On behalf of the Department of Defense, I request that the Senate reconsider the proposed \$230 million rescission.

JOHN DEUTCH.

RESTORING RESCISSION OF BASE CLOSURE FUNDING

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I support the efforts of my colleague from South Carolina, Senator THURMOND, to restore funding \$104 million in funding for base closure accounts, which the Appropriations Committee recommended for rescission. It is vitally important that these funds remain available to pay for the necessary costs of closing, cleaning up, and transferring unnecessary military bases to the communities for reuse.

The Appropriations Committee indicates in the report accompanying the bill that these rescissions are being taken because large amounts of appropriated funds remain unobligated in

these accounts. That may be true. But that in no way means that the funds are not necessary.

The accounts from which the committee recommended rescinding \$104 million include the funding for environmental restoration at closing military bases. These costs are not insignificant, and they represent a Federal liability which must be met.

On Monday, March 27, the Washington Post reported on yet another study that concluded that "the cost of cleaning up military bases is skyrocketing * * *." My colleague from Alaska has often raised this problem of the increasing cost of cleaning up closing military bases as a reason to delay the BRAC process. Yet, now the committee is recommending that we rescind funds already appropriated for environmental cleanup at closing military bases. I cannot understand the logic of doing so.

These accounts from which the committee recommends we rescind money also include funding to pay for military construction at bases where consolidations and realignments will occur because of BRAC actions. The cost of providing this new infrastructure was factored into the BRAC's decision-making process and is important to provide necessary support for activities moved to other locations. It is not reasonable to assume that adding functions to an existing base will not require some expenditure of funds for buildings and support.

All of these funds are necessary to complete the base closure and realignment process. There are specific projects and activities for which these funds were appropriated—jobs which need to be completed so that the communities surrounding the closing bases can implement their reuse plans as quickly as possible.

I wonder whether the committee would consider, as a possible reason for the large amount of unobligated balances in these accounts, that the process for closing bases is, without exaggeration, ponderous.

In my home State of Arizona, Williams Air Force Base, which was ordered closed in 1991, has been screened for Federal agency reuse at least three times. Homeless applications are still pending at the Department of Health and Human Services. The Air Force Base Conversion Agency and the local communities have not yet agreed on the final details of reuse of the base. Here we are, nearly 4 years after the BRAC ordered the base closed, and the Air Force is still paying the bill for maintaining the base. And more importantly, the community is still not able to recover fully from the economic impact of losing the base.

The base closure process ought not take 4 years to complete. I intend to introduce legislation to streamline the Federal screening process and to give greater flexibility to recognized community groups to coordinate, develop,

and implement reuse plans for closing bases.

Until the process is fixed, however, it is not surprising that large amounts of the base closure funding remain unspent. Again, though, that does not mean that the funds are not needed. Eliminating these funds would only exacerbate the difficulty of closing bases and conveying the property to the subsequent owners in a timely fashion.

This is a painful enough process for a community that relied on the military base in its midst for jobs and economic stability. Let's not aggravate the situation by imperiling the Services' ability to complete the process as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I understand that Senator THURMOND has received assurances from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Military Construction that the conferees on this bill will consider restoring these funds in the conference. I applaud that commitment.

I must state, however, that I support restoring these funds with one condition. I believe that the restoration of these funds must not be done at the cost of increasing the Federal deficit. I believe the \$104 million in restored funding must be fully offset by rescissions of low priority funds.

Mr. President, I had intended to offer a second degree amendment to rescind \$104 million from the administrative and travel accounts of the Federal Government.

The amendment would have provided a full offset for the cost of restoring the BRAC-related funds in the amendment of Senator THURMOND. The Senate bill already provides \$13 billion in total spending rescissions, but this is \$4 billion less than the House bill. We should not further exacerbate the shortfall in deficit reduction funds, if we can find an offsetting reduction.

I believe the reduction of \$104 million in Government administrative and travel expenses would have been an appropriate reduction. The Office of Management advised me that, in fiscal year 1995 alone, \$107.2 billion will be spent for administration and travel. The amendment would have rescinded only \$104 million from a \$107 billion account—less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total expenditures. Out of a budget of \$107 billion, it seems quite likely that the small amount which would be rescinded by this amendment will not be devastating to the operation of any government office. One-tenth of 1 percent of the administrative and travel budget of any Federal organization should not hamper the operations of that organization.

Mr. President, the Department of Defense and the communities surrounding closing bases need the funding in the BRAC accounts to finish a job already underway. We should not rescind those funds. I believe we should rescind a minuscule portion—less than one-tenth of 1 percent—of the Federal Government's administrative and travel bud-

et to pay for these necessary BRAC-related activities.

Unfortunately, we were unable to come to agreement on the offsets I intended to propose. Therefore, Senator THURMOND has chosen to rely on the assurances he has received from Senator BURNS concerning restoring these funds in the conference. I respectfully urge the conferees to identify offsetting rescissions in other areas to pay for the restoration of these funds.

Mr. President, it is imperative that we not decrease the amount of deficit reduction in this bill. We are undertaking the daunting task of prioritizing Federal spending and reducing the Federal debt, working toward a balanced Federal budget. By eliminating unnecessary and wasteful spending of prior year appropriated funds, we can begin our review of the fiscal year 1996 budget with money in the bank.

Therefore, the conferees on this bill should ensure that an offsetting reduction is made for the restoration of these BRAC-related funds. The conference agreement should preserve at least the level of deficit reduction contained in the Senate bill, and in my view, should move toward the greater deficit reduction in the House bill. As important as this funding is for BRAC cleanup and implementation, I do not believe it should be restored at the cost of increasing the deficit.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

1994 ANNUAL REPORT ON ALASKA'S NATURAL RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 40

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying

report; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1994 Annual Report on Alaska's Mineral Resources, as required by section 1011 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96-487; 16 U.S.C. 3151). This report contains pertinent public information relating to minerals in Alaska gathered by the U.S. Geological Survey, the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and other Federal agencies.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 3, 1995.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-690. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the text of international agreements other than treaties, and background statements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-691. A message from the Chairman of the Board of the African Development Foundation, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the African Development Foundation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-693. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the United States contribution to the tenth replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-694. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a United States contribution to the Interest Subsidy Account of the Successor (EASF II) to the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility of the International Monetary Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-695. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration Buy America Waivers for fiscal years 1992 and 1993; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-696. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-31 enacted by the Council on March 7, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-697. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-32 enacted by the Council on March 7, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-698. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-34 enacted by the Council on March 7, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-699. A communication from the Special Counsel of the United States, transmitting,

pursuant to law, a report relative to the fiscal year 1994 audit and investigative activities of the Office of Special Counsel; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-700. A communication from the HUD Secretary's designee to the Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Board's internal control and financial management systems; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-701. A communication from the Chairman of the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Board's audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-702. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to improve administration of sanctions against unfit health care providers under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-703. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of GAO reports released in February 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-704. A communication from the Executive Director of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting, pursuant to law, the statement of the Commission under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-705. A communication from the Director of the Federal Judicial Center, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Center's annual report for 1994; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-706. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation to amend Chapter 30 of Title 35 to afford third parties an opportunity for greater participation in reexamination proceedings before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 523. A bill to amend the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act to authorize additional measures to carry out the control of salinity upstream of Imperial Dam in a cost-effective manner, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-24).

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, without amendment:

S. 641. A bill to reauthorize the Ryan White CARE Act of 1990, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-25).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. INOUE):

S. 660. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for transportation by the Department of Defense of certain children requiring specialized medical services in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOTT:

S. 661. A bill to require the continued availability of \$1 Federal reserve notes for circulation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. 662. A bill to implement the interim agreement for the conservation of Yukon River salmon stocks agreed to by the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada on February 3, 1995, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S. Res. 99. A resolution commending the 125th anniversary of Allen University, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. INOUE):

S. 660. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for transportation by the Department of Defense of certain children requiring specialized medical services in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSPORTATION FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that would allow the Department of Defense to provide transportation for children with disabilities seeking medical treatment in the United States. I am pleased that Senator INOUE has joined me in cosponsoring this measure.

The Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children in Honolulu currently provides free medical treatment for disabled children. However, many of these children must wait several months before funds are available for them to travel from their homes in the Pacific to Hawaii. As of February 28, 1995, Shriners Hospital had 177 Pacific rim children with disabilities seeking medical treatment.

The legislation I am introducing authorizes the Department of Defense to offer transportation, on a space available basis, to a disabled child seeking free medical treatment. The children would come from United States territories, such as American Samoa and Guam, and from countries with historic ties to the United States, including the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, Saipan, Palau, Western Samoa, and the Philippines.

Providing transportation for disabled children from these Pacific rim countries and territories will enhance the United States relationship with these entities. The goodwill generated by this initiative will contribute to our ef-

forts to be "good neighbors" in the Pacific. The cost of this measure would be nominal since transportation would be on a space-available basis.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this measure. •

By Mr. LOTT:

S. 661. A bill to require the continued availability of \$1 Federal reserve notes for circulation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SAVE THE GREENBACK ACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the following bill designed to preserve the status of the American \$1 bill. The dollar bill—also known as the American greenback—has been a staple of our currency since 1862, and since 1869 has carried the likeness of the founder of our Nation: George Washington.

During that entire period, we have never heard the American people express their disagreement, or their displeasure, with the \$1 bill. In fact, as many of you are well aware, the mere mention of any redesign of our currency inevitably triggers an onslaught of calls from constituents.

In past Congresses there have been misguided efforts by special interests to replace the \$1 bill with a coin. The proponents of this coin make three bold claims: that it will be easier to handle, that it will be popular with the American people, and that it will save money.

Let me address each of these claims in turn: Imagine if you will, replacing ten \$1 bills in your wallet with ten \$1 coins in your pocket. After several days, one might suspect a conspiracy by clothing manufacturers in drafting the dollar coin proposal. I do not know anyone who prefers a pocketful of coins to a wallet containing dollar bills.

As to the coin's so-called popularity with the American people; there have been three national polls on this issue during the past year. In every poll, the American people overwhelmingly rejected any attempt to do away with the dollar bill and have expressed their displeasure for replacing it with a coin.

The most recent poll was conducted in January, under the auspices of the House Budget Committee. Only 18 percent of those questioned preferred a dollar coin. Earlier polls have indicated a very real concern by American people that if the coin bill becomes law, the price of items purchased from vending machines such as food, laundry, and soft drinks will rise. They also expect to see increases in the costs of other everyday items such as parking meters and pay telephone calls.

Mr. President, legislation designed to eliminate the dollar bill will be an excuse by special interests to raise prices on everyday items. Eliminating the dollar bill and replacing it with a dollar coin will likely result in two things: Higher prices to consumers, and more weight in our pocket.

None of us really want to see a repeat of the Susan B. Anthony drama in

which the dollar coin was overwhelmingly rejected by the public. It did not save us a nickel when it was minted, although officials said at the time that savings would be realized. At this moment, there are over \$300 million in Susan B. Anthony coins sitting idle in the U.S. Mint. Will we have to make room in a few years time for another dollar coin, because we didn't heed the lessons of the past?

It is not enough to blame the failure of the Susan B. Anthony dollar on its design alone. The people overwhelmingly rejected it as part of the currency system. The people had a choice and they voted against it. The bill I am introducing today seeks to protect the consumer from the hidden cost increases which would result from a mandated replacement of the dollar bill with a dollar coin.

As I travel around Mississippi, I hear people telling me that we need to reform welfare, slam the door on convicted criminals, and eliminate waste. I do not hear a lot of complaints that we need a dollar coin to replace the face of George Washington in our wallets.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

By Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. 662. A bill to implement the interim agreement for the conservation of Yukon River salmon stocks agreed to by the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada on February 3, 1995, and for other purposes; to the committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

YUKON RIVER SALMON ACT

• Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce legislation today that would implement the new interim agreement for the conservation of Yukon River salmon stocks reached between the United States and Canada on February 3, 1995—the Yukon Agreement.

The title of my bill is the “Yukon River Salmon Act of 1995.”

A total of 1,875 miles long, the Yukon River is the fourth largest river in North America, and runs from head waters deep in Canada, through the heart of Alaska, and into the Bering Sea.

Commercial and subsistence fishermen from Canada to the Alaskan shores of the Bering Sea rely on the salmon resources of this massive river.

The Yukon Agreement will assure both Alaskans and Canadians living along the Yukon River that these vital salmon resources will be carefully managed, restored, and enhanced in the years ahead.

I would like to commend the State Department, State of Alaska, and the many Alaskans who were instrumental in bringing about this agreement.

It is great to see the positive results that can occur when we work together with our Canadian neighbors.

The bill I am introducing today would provide for U.S. representation

on a new Yukon River Panel created under the Yukon Agreement.

The Yukon River Panel will include representatives from both the United States and Canada, and will make management, restoration and enhancement suggestions to the entities responsible for conserving and managing Yukon River salmon on both sides of the United States-Canada border.

Under the bill, the United States would have six Yukon River Panel members: one appointed by the Secretary of State; one representing the State of Alaska; and four representatives knowledgeable and experienced with Yukon River salmon fisheries who would be appointed by the Governor of Alaska.

At least one of the four panel members appointed by the Governor must represent the Upper Yukon; at least one must represent the Lower Yukon; and at least one must be an Alaska Native.

Panel members will serve 4-year terms, and will be eligible for reappointment.

The Secretary of State and Governor of Alaska would be authorized to designate an alternate panel member, meeting the same qualifications, for each of the panel members they have authority to appoint under the bill.

The Yukon River Panel would be exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act, similar to the treatment of the Pacific Salmon Commission and Pacific Salmon Treaty panels under the Pacific Salmon Treaty enabling legislation—Public Law 99-5.

Panel members would be paid at the GS-16 rate while on duty, which is consistent with the pay received by panels under the Pacific Salmon Treaty enabling legislation.

Decisions by the U.S. section of the Yukon River Panel would occur by the consensus of five of the panel members: the State of Alaska's representative, and the four at-large panel members. The Federal member would not vote. This is similar to the voting structure of the Pacific Salmon Commission.

As with the Pacific Salmon Commission, the Federal representative would serve as a neutral and objective party if disagreements arise among members of the U.S. section of the panel.

The bill also authorizes an advisory committee, with members to be appointed by the Governor of Alaska.

This advisory committee would include between 8 and 12 members knowledgeable and experienced with regard to salmon fisheries on the Yukon River.

Advisory committee members would receive no compensation for their service, but could be reimbursed for travel expenses.

Advisory committee members would serve 2-year terms and would be eligible for reappointment.

The Yukon Agreement requires each country to designate a responsible management entity for the harvest of salmon originating in the Yukon,

which will receive recommendations of the Yukon River Panel.

My legislation would designate the State of Alaska's Department of Fish and Game as the responsible management entity for the United States.

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game does most of the salmon research and assessment on the Yukon, and is the primary manager of commercial harvests on the Yukon.

The designation of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is for the purposes of the Yukon Agreement, and is not meant to expand, diminish or change Federal or State authority with respect to salmon management.

The Yukon River Panel would be authorized under the bill to make recommendations to the Department of Interior, Department of Commerce, Department of State, the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, and to other Federal or State entities as it feels appropriate.

Recommendations by the Yukon River Panel under both the agreement and the legislation I am introducing today are advisory in nature.

The Yukon Agreement states that if the Pacific Salmon Treaty should terminate before the termination of the Yukon Agreement, the Yukon Panel would become the Yukon River Salmon Commission and continue under existing provisions of the treaty that apply to the Yukon.

The bill I am introducing allows for the shift from the Yukon River Panel to the Yukon River Salmon Commission should the Pacific Salmon Treaty terminate.

If the Pacific Salmon Treaty fails, the provisions in the bill which apply to the Yukon River Panel would thereafter apply to the Yukon River Salmon Commission, and all provisions of the bill, such as the voting structure, would remain in effect.

The legislation would authorize \$400,000 in each of fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999 to the Secretary of Commerce to make the payment necessary under the Yukon Agreement to the Yukon River Restoration and Enhancement Fund.

This money will be used primarily for restoration and enhancement in Canada, which helps all fishermen along the Yukon. In accordance with the Yukon Agreement, the Yukon River Panel will decide how this money is spent.

The bill would also authorize appropriations to pay panel members, and to reimburse panel members, alternate panel members, advisory committee members, and U.S. members of a joint technical committee for their travel expenses.

The Subcommittee on Oceans and Fisheries has received testimony on the Yukon Agreement and relating to this implementing legislation during our recent hearings on the Magnuson Act reauthorization.

It is my hope to include the Yukon River Salmon Act—which I believe to be noncontroversial—on S. 267, the Fisheries Act of 1995, when S. 267 goes to the Senate floor.

I am joined by Senator MURKOWSKI in introducing the Yukon River Salmon Act of 1995.

I request that the bill be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 662

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Yukon River Salmon Act of 1995.”

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to implement the interim agreement for the conservation of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada agreed to through an exchange of notes between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada on February 3, 1995;

(2) to provide for representation by the United States on the Yukon River Panel established under such agreement; and

(3) to authorize to be appropriated sums necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the United States under such agreement.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) The term “Agreement” means the interim agreement for the conservation of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada agreed to through an exchange of notes between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada on February 3, 1995.

(2) The term “Panel” means the Yukon River Panel established by the Agreement.

(3) The term “Yukon River Joint Technical Committee” means the technical committee established by paragraph C.2 of the Memorandum of Understanding concerning the Pacific Salmon Treaty between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada recorded January 28, 1985.

SEC. 4. PANEL.

(a) REPRESENTATION.—The United States shall be represented on the Panel by six individuals, of whom—

(1) one (1) shall be an official of the United States Government with expertise in salmon conservation and management;

(2) one (1) shall be an official of the State of Alaska with expertise in salmon conservation and management; and

(3) four (4) shall be knowledgeable and experienced with regard to the salmon fisheries on the Yukon River.

(b) APPOINTMENTS.—Panel members shall be appointed as follows:

(1) The Panel member described in subsection (a)(1) shall be appointed by the Secretary of State.

(2) The Panel member described in subsection (a)(2) shall be appointed by the Governor of Alaska.

(3) The Panel members described in subsection (a)(3) shall be appointed by the Governor of Alaska, who shall consider nominations provided by organizations with expertise in Yukon River salmon fisheries. The Governor of Alaska shall appoint at least one member under subsection (a)(3) who is qualified to represent the interests of Lower Yukon River fishing districts, and at least one member who is qualified to represent the interests of Upper Yukon River fishing districts.

At least one of the Panel members under subsection (a)(3) shall be an Alaska Native.

(c) ALTERNATES.—The Secretary of State and Governor of Alaska may designate an alternate Panel member for each Panel member they appoint under subsection (b), who meets the same qualifications, to serve in the absence of the Panel member.

(d) TERM LENGTH.—Panel members and alternate Panel members shall serve four-year terms. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of any term shall be appointed for the remainder of that term.

(e) REAPPOINTMENT.—Panel members and alternate Panel members shall be eligible for reappointment.

(f) DECISIONS.—Decisions by the United States section of the Panel shall be made by the consensus of the Panel members appointed under paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a).

(g) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out their functions under the Agreement, Panel members may consult with such other interested parties as they consider appropriate.

SEC. 5. ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) APPOINTMENTS.—The Governor of Alaska may appoint an Advisory Committee of not less than eight (8), but not more than twelve (12), individuals who are knowledgeable and experienced with regard to the salmon fisheries on the Yukon River. Members of the Advisory Committee may attend all meetings of the United States section of the Panel, and shall be given the opportunity to examine and be heard on any matter under consideration by the United States section of the Panel.

(b) COMPENSATION.—The members of such advisory committee shall receive no compensation for their services.

(c) TERM LENGTH.—Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of any term shall be appointed for the remainder of that term.

(b) REAPPOINTMENT.—Advisory Committee members shall be eligible for reappointment.

SEC. 6. EXEMPTION.

The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 1 et seq.) shall not apply to the Panel, the Yukon River Joint Technical Committee, or the Advisory Committee created under section 5 of this Act.

SEC. 7. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY.

(a) RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game shall be the responsible management entity for the United States for the purposes of the Agreement.

(b) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—The designation under subsection (a) shall not be considered to expand, diminish or change the management authority of the State of Alaska or the Federal government with respect to fishery resources.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS OF PANEL.—In addition to recommendations made by the Panel to the responsible management entities in accordance with the Agreement, the Panel may make recommendations concerning the conservation and management of salmon originating in the Yukon River to the Department of Interior, Department of Commerce, Department of State, North Pacific Fishery Management Council, and other Federal or State entities as appropriate. Recommendations by the Panel shall be advisory in nature.

SEC. 8. CONTINUATION OF AGREEMENT.

In the event that the Treaty between Canada and the United States of America concerning Pacific Salmon, signed at Ottawa, January 28, 1985, terminates prior to the termination of the Agreement, and the functions of the Panel are assumed by the

“Yukon River Salmon Commission” referenced in the Agreement, the provisions of this Act which apply to the Panel shall thereafter apply to the Yukon River Salmon Commission, and the other provisions of this Act shall remain in effect.

SEC. 9. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.

(a) Panel members and alternate Panel members who are not State or Federal employees shall receive compensation at the daily rate of GS-16 of the General Schedule when engaged in the actual performance of duties.

(b) Travel and other necessary expenses shall be paid for all Panel members, alternate Panel members, United States members of the Joint Technical Committee, and members of the Advisory Committee when engaged in the actual performance of duties.

(c) Except for officials of the United States Government, individuals described in subsection (b) shall not be considered to be Federal employees while engaged in the actual performance of duties, except for the purposes of injury compensation or tort claims liability as provided in chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 71 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes and provisions of the Agreement and this Act including—

(a) necessary travel expenses of Panel members, alternate Panel members, United States members of the Joint Technical Committee, and members of the Advisory Committee in accordance with Federal Travel Regulations and sections 4701, 5702, 5704 through 5708, and 5731 of title 5, United States Code;

(b) the United States share of the joint expenses of the Panel and the Joint Technical Committee, provided that Panel members and alternate Panel members shall not, with respect to commitments concerning the United States share of the joint expenses, be subject to section 262(b) of title 22, United States Code, insofar as it limits the authority of United States representatives to international organizations with respect to such commitments; and

(c) by the Secretary of Commerce, \$400,000 in each of fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999 to be contributed to the Yukon River Restoration and Enhancement Fund and used in accordance with the Agreement.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 198

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 198, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes.

S. 243

At the request of Mr. ROTH, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 243, a bill to provide greater access to civil justice by reducing costs and delay, and for other purposes.

S. 256

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish procedures for determining the status of certain missing members of the Armed Forces and certain civilians, and for other purposes.

S. 258

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional safeguards to protect taxpayer rights.

S. 303

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of S. 303, a bill to establish rules governing product liability actions against raw materials and bulk component suppliers to medical device manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 324

At the request of Mr. ROTH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 324, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude from the definition of employee firefighters and rescue squad workers who perform volunteer services and to prevent employers from requiring employees who are firefighters or rescue squad workers to perform volunteer services, and to allow an employer not to pay overtime compensation to a firefighter or rescue squad worker who performs volunteer services for the employer, and for other purposes.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 391, a bill to authorize and direct the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to undertake activities to halt and reverse the decline in forest health on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

S. 434

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 434, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deductibility of business meal expenses for individuals who are subject to Federal limitations on hours of service.

S. 495

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 495, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to stabilize the student loan programs, improve congressional oversight, and for other purposes.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the names of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] were added as cosponsors of S. 524, a bill to prohibit insurers from denying health insurance coverage, benefits, or varying premiums based on the status of an individual as a victim of domestic violence and for other purposes.

S. 565

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] was added as a cosponsor of S.

565, a bill to regulate interstate commerce by providing for a uniform product liability law, and for other purposes.

S. 581

At the request of Mr. FAIRCLOTH, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] were added as cosponsors of S. 581, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to repeal those provisions of Federal law that require employees to pay union dues or fees as a condition of employment, and for other purposes.

S. 603

At the request of Mr. FAIRCLOTH, the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] were added as cosponsors of S. 603, a bill to nullify an executive order that prohibits Federal contracts with companies that hire permanent replacements for striking employees, and for other purposes.

S. 641

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] were added as cosponsors of S. 641, a bill to reauthorize the Ryan White CARE Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 31

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 31, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant Congress and the States the power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 99—COM-MENDING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALLEN UNIVERSITY

Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 99

Whereas Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina, is in the midst of a year-long celebration of the 125th anniversary of the University;

Whereas Allen University has produced local and national leaders who have served communities and the United States in an exemplary way;

Whereas the late Bishop John Mifflin Brown and the people of the Columbia Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church had the vision to establish a school for the education of newly freed slaves in 1870 in Cokesbury, South Carolina, naming the school for the predecessor to Bishop Brown, Bishop Daniel Alexander Payne, and appointing Professor J.W. Morris as president;

Whereas Bishop William F. Dickerson led a successful effort to relocate the school to Columbia, South Carolina, and rename the school in 1880 for Bishop Richard Allen, the founder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, while the Reverend James C. Waters assumed the presidency;

Whereas the University has a long tradition of producing clergy and lay leadership for the African Methodist Episcopal Church;

Whereas the University has produced numerous scholars, attorneys, physicians, teachers, and business and governmental leaders, and other professionals who have risen to positions of notoriety in the African-American community as a whole;

Whereas Doctor Margaret Dixon is an exemplary Allen University Alumnae who has recently been elected president of the American Association of Retired People;

Whereas the University has endured all the difficulties familiar to historically black colleges and universities;

Whereas the University, with an historic campus, is an accredited member institution of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools;

Whereas the University, under the present leadership of Bishop John Hurst Adams and President David T. Shannon, is equipped to serve non-traditional students and others who would otherwise not have the opportunity for a college education, as well as remaining faithful to the traditional goals of the University of clergy and leadership education; and

Whereas the University still strives to live up to the motto of the University, which is "Heads to Think, Hands to Work, and Hearts to Love": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress—

(1) commends Allen University for 125 years of progress, commitment, and dedication in the shaping of productive lives; and

(2) extends best wishes to Allen University and hopes the University will have a productive future that continues the accomplishments of the past.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCIS-SIONS ACT

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO. 447

(Ordered to lie on table.)

Mr. WELLSTONE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to amendment No. 420 proposed by Mr. HATFIELD to the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescission for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 29, line 16, strike "\$2,185,935,000" and insert "\$2,191,435,000".

On page 55, line 4, strike "\$4,800,000,000" and insert "\$4,794,500,000".

KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 448

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to amendment No. 420 proposed by Mr. HATFIELD to the bill, H.R. 1158, supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place in the amdt, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX AVOIDANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should act as quickly as possible to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to eliminate the ability of persons to avoid taxes by relinquishing their United States citizenship.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the amendment referred to in subsection (a) should take effect as if enacted on February 6, 1995.

BARNUM & BAILEY CIRCUS COMMEMORATION

SMITH AMENDMENT NO. 449

Mr. SMITH proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Ringling Bros., and Barnum & Bailey Circus anniversary commemoration; as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 9 through 13, and insert the following: "performers, on the Capitol Grounds, on April 3, 1995, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

No elephants shall be allowed on the Capitol Grounds for the purpose of this event."

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will be holding an oversight hearing on Wednesday, April 5, 1995, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building on providing direct funding through block grants to tribes to administer welfare and other social service programs.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOREIGN COMMERCE AND TOURISM

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Foreign Commerce and Tourism of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet Monday, April 3, 1995, at 9:30 a.m. on S. 565, the Product Liability Fairness Act of 1995.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAXATION AND IRS OVERSIGHT

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight of the Finance Committee be permitted to meet Monday, April 3, 1995, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-215, to conduct a hearing on the research and experimentation [R&E] tax credit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION ON CERTAIN VOTES

• Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, on March 30, 1995, I was necessarily absent from rollcall votes. If I were present on that day, I would have voted as follows: "Yea" on rollcall vote No. 121 to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY]; "nay" on rollcall vote No. 122 to lay on the table amendment No. 435 of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY]; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 123 to lay on the table amendment No. 436 of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER]; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 124 on amendment No. 437 of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY]; and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 125 to lay on the table amendment No. 438 of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID].•

HONG KONG

• Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the week before last I had the pleasure of cohosting a breakfast with Congressman GILMAN for Lu Ping. Mr. Lu is the head of the People's Republic of China's Office of Hong Kong and Macau Affairs, as well as a body known as the Preliminary Working Committee. In other words, he is the Chinese official in charge of overseeing the transition of Hong Kong from a dependent territory of the United Kingdom to a special administrative region under the jurisdiction of the People's Republic of China in the summer of 1997.

Mr. Lu and his group were, in effect, on a public relations tour of the United States to convince policymakers here—as well as an audience back home—that Hong Kong will continue to thrive as a bastion of capitalism after 1997. Mr. Lu did his job well. He spoke eloquently and reassuringly, painting a rosy picture for the colony's future without sounding phony or unrealistic. While I greatly appreciated the opportunity to meet with Mr. Lu and hear his views, I have a concern with his pronouncements which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Despite his polished presentation it seemed to me that his views diverged little, if at all, from the official party line. Certainly, this was not entirely unexpected. Members of the PRC bu-

reaucracy are not often given to flights of independence of thought or opinion. While he certainly seemed genuine and straight-forward, I could not shake the feeling that his statements were simply a glossy version of what we have been hearing from Beijing on this topic for some time. He spoke at length about how Hong Kong's present status would be protected, but said nothing substantive about the mechanics of that protection. As a writer for the Nanhua Zaobao, South China Morning Post, so accurately put it:

[D]espite having an excellent ambassador in the eloquent English-speaking Mr. Lu, and in spite of the articulate back-up of sharp minds like those of Rita Fan and Simon Lee, the fact remained that they had—to American ears at least—very little to say. The style was good, but the U.S. needs a lot more meat in its sandwiches.

Moreover, while painting a picture of a bright fairy-tale scene full of sunshine and singing birds, Mr. Lu neglected to peer at the troll under the bridge: The increasing threats made to the rule of law in Hong Kong. In 1984, the People's Republic of China and Great Britain finalized a document known as the Joint Declaration. The declaration set forth PRC guarantees for Hong Kong's continued autonomy after 1997, an elected local legislature, and the continuation of its common-law legal system. Unfortunately, since that time Beijing has acted in such a way so as to call its commitment to these basic principles into question. In 1990, the National People's Congress enacted what is known as the Basic Law, the statutes that will govern Hong Kong after 1997. In contravention of the Joint Declaration, it—inter alia—subordinates the colony's legislative council to an executive appointed by Beijing, and assigns a power of judicial interpretation not to the local courts but to the Standing Committee of the People's Congress. In 1993, a senior official of the PRC's judicial branch intimated that the People's Republic of China will replace Hong Kong's common-law system with one more closely resembling China's where the civil law is merely an extension of the party.

Finally, and most ominously in my opinion, the People's Republic of China has called into doubt its commitment to establish a Court of Final Appeal in Hong Kong. Presently, final judicial decisions are appealable to the Privy Council in London. Of course, that cannot continue to be the case after reversion, and one of the principle concerns of the residents of the colony is that, after 1997, local legal decisions continue to be appealable to a court with interests not inimicable to the common law and judicial independence from extralegal influences. Without a local final appeals court, they worry—rightly in my opinion—that the final arbiter of the law in Hong Kong will be a party cadre in Beijing. So, the Joint Declaration provided for the establishment of a Court of Final Appeal [CFR]. Since that time, however, there has

been increased wrangling between Beijing and London, and Hong Kong, over the form of the court; and, for a variety of reasons I will not expound upon here, the future of the CFR is much in question. While it is probably not fair to lay 100 percent of the blame for the imbroglio over the CFA on China, that country, I believe, bears a lion's share.

Mr. President, the continuation of the rule of law in Hong Kong after 1997 is synonymous with its ability to remain a thriving center of finance and democracy at the doorstep of the Communist behemoth to the north. The rule of law ensures that business can be conducted in a fair and secure way, that contracts are binding, and that there is a predictable and impartial means of settling disputes and appeals. Just what kind of problems the absence of the rule of law creates in China is easily illustrated. McDonald's had a contract with the Peoples Republic of China for a restaurant on Tiananmen Square. It operated there for several years, until the Chinese Government decided that it wanted to give the choice location to someone else. Consequently, despite contractual provisions to the contrary, the Chinese kicked McDonald's out of their location. Another company, Revpower, Ltd., entered into a contract with the Government-owned Shanghai Far-East Aero-Technology Import and Export Corp. After a dispute between the two was settled by arbitration, an arbitral award in the amount of \$6.6 million was made against the Shanghai firm. Despite its contractual promise, however, the Chinese firm refused to abide by the results of the arbitration. Revpower subsequently sought the assistance of the Shanghai Intermediate People's Court in enforcing the award, but the court has failed to act or even acknowledge the existence of the suit. One can see why the absence of the rule of law would make businesses skittish.

Mr. President, I come to the floor today as the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to let the people of Hong Kong—as well as the government in Beijing—know that the United States take great interest in the future of Hong Kong. We will be keenly watching to be sure that the parties live up to the letter and spirit of the Joint Declaration, especially any developments regarding the CFR and the rule of law. The People Republic of China should know that we will use how it treats Hong Kong as a strong indicator on how it will be expected to act in other areas such as the WTO or similar body, for example. If the PRC fails in the former, then I will be hard-pressed to support its accession to the latter. The world is watching, Mr. President; let us hope that we will like what we see.●

TRIBUTE TO CAROL FITZGERALD

● Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding member of the Nevada judicial system who

is retiring today after 30 years of service. I rise to honor Carol C. Fitzgerald. Ms. Fitzgerald's career culminated in 1994, her final year of service, with the receipt of the prestigious Angie Award from the Federal Court Clerks' Association. The Angie Award honors those individuals who consistently display unrelenting commitment to improving the administration of justice, fearless pursuit of causes and goals regardless of their popularity, and unblemished integrity. Ms. Fitzgerald demonstrated all of those characteristics throughout her 30 years of service.

She joined the clerk's office in the District of Nevada on March 15, 1965, and was appointed clerk of the court on April 1, 1976 by the Honorable Roger D. Foley. Under Ms. Fitzgerald's capable leadership, the clerk's office grew from less than 10 employees to well over 50. The number of case filings for the district of Nevada has reached the third highest in the Nation.

Carol has consistently been active in Nevada's judicial community. She served 4 years as a member of the district clerk's liaison committee to the ninth circuit judicial conference, was a member of the gender bias subcommittee, and was chair of the liaison committee. She was a member of the ninth circuit automation and technology committee, the ninth circuit task force on court reporting, and the chair of the subcommittee on court reporter/recorder management. Ms. Fitzgerald was also president of the Federal Court Clerks' Association.

As a practicing trial attorney, I first hand witnessed the tireless efforts of Carol Fitzgerald to serve the interests of the public, the bar, and the judiciary. Her efforts culminated in a relationship of efficiency and trust by all three. As a member of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate, I also witnessed Carol's advocacy of the Federal court in the federal bureaucracy. Her endeavors on the court's behalf bore fruit in the outstanding link now found between the Nevada Federal judiciary and the Nevada congressional delegation.

So, as this fine woman moves from the court to another sphere of community involvement, I congratulate and applaud her good works and friendship.●

ABOLISH THE SOURCE TAX

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, today I speak in support of an important piece of legislation designated to eliminate an unfair practice affecting thousands of senior citizens in my home State of Washington. It is S. 44, introduced by my distinguished colleagues from Nevada, Senators REID and BRYAN, to abolish the so-called source tax.

As it stands today, retirees living anywhere in the country may find that their retirement pensions are taxed by a State in which they no longer reside. A State may tax a nonresident's pension simply because the person spent

all, or part of, his or her working years in that State. This unjust tax is, in many cases, automatically deducted from the retiree's pension benefit every month.

Retirees are outraged because their taxes are going to pay for services of which they cannot take advantage. They are not able to partake in the senior services, medical services, transportation facilities, or public parks in States where they no longer reside. They do not vote in those States and cannot influence how their tax dollars are being spent. They are, however, forced to pay taxes to support these services so that others may benefit from them. The seniors in my State characterize this practice as taxation without representation. I agree.

The source tax is not only taxation without representation, but also a further drain on the already limited and fixed incomes of our senior citizens. Seniors, dependent upon fixed incomes to pay their bills and buy their groceries, are shocked when they learn that they may not have enough to get by because of the taxation policies of other States.

Many senior citizens have written to me about this burdensome practice. Seniors throughout the State of Washington have expressed their outrage and frustration at being taxed by other States. And, as I travel around the State listening to the concerns of the citizens, this issue is continually brought to my attention.

We need to correct this practice now. That is why I cosponsored S. 44, the Source Tax Elimination Act. I encourage my colleagues to help me pass this bill and restore tax fairness to our retirees.●

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION ON CERTAIN VOTES

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I regret being absent for several votes on Thursday, March 30, 1995. However, I felt an obligation to be home in order to take part in the Base Realignment and Closure Commission hearing and site tour of Malmstrom Air Force Base. These events will help determine Malmstrom's future; and I firmly believe that Malmstrom plays a crucial role in our national defense and the community of Great Falls, MT.

Yet I want to briefly express my support for two amendments, one offered by Senator KERREY of Nebraska and the other offered by Senator SHELBY, that would have curbed wasteful spending on Federal courthouses. This is a problem I helped bring to light last year during an investigation I conducted as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I am pleased that the Senate is now on record as saying we must get wasteful courthouse spending under control.●

**CONGRATULATING JIM NICHOLSON
AND PVS CHEMICALS, INC., ON
50TH ANNIVERSARY**

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate PVS Chemicals, based in Detroit, MI, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. Jim Nicholson, president and chief executive officer of PVS, and son of founder Floyd A. "Nick" Nicholson, has a great deal of which he should be proud. Since he came to head PVS in 1979 Jim has diversified its products and services and expanded into the international marketplace while maintaining the company's commitment to safety, quality, environmental responsibility, customer service, and employee and community support.

Founded in 1945 in Detroit as Pressure Vessel Service, Inc., PVS has grown and expanded dramatically. Today it manufactures inorganic chemicals for industry, and also for municipal water treatment. With reported sales of \$121.7 million in 1994, PVS also expedites recycling of selected chemical wastes and operates a licensed waste treatment facility in Detroit.

In addition to its commitment to the Responsible Care Program of the Chemical Manufacturers Association and to the Responsible Distribution Program of the National Association of Chemical Distributors, PVS maintains an active concern with improving the quality of life in the communities in which its plants are located. Each PVS location chooses a direction for its own community outreach activities. Educational support has been a major focus, including scholarships, intern opportunities, mentoring, tutoring, career day participation, equipment and materials donations, and significant contributions at the college level. Site adjacent cleanup activities also are a common PVS contribution to the community. River cleanups, trash pickup, and even adoption of park areas and vacant blocks characterize these efforts to spruce up PVS neighborhoods. And PVS plans to extend and integrate all of these activities to better help their communities.

PVS' public spirit clearly stems from the vision of its president and CEO, Jim Nicholson. Jim took over PVS in 1979 after serving a stint overseas with the First National Bank of Chicago and serving in PVS as a vice president and later treasurer. He is an active member of his community, having served as vice chairman for economic development for Mayor Archer's transition committee, on various boards of directors and on the Advisory Board of United Way for Southeastern Michigan, the Detroit Institute of Arts Founders Society Corporate Relations Committee, and the dean's board of advisors for the Wayne State University School of Business Administration. He also is actively involved with the Michigan Chapter of the Nature Conservancy and the United Negro College Fund and has served on committees for

the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, and several other charitable causes.

Mr. President, this Nation needs more companies like PVS, which take seriously their obligations to the communities in which they work and live. I congratulate PVS on 50 years of responsible, successful work, and wish them many more. ●

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE D. DALTON

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise before you today to pay tribute to the distinguished winner of the Wisconsin Business Leader of the Year Award for 1994. George D. Dalton, chairman and chief executive officer of Fiserv, Inc., has been selected to receive this prestigious award which is presented annually by the Harvard Business School Club of Wisconsin and the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel newspaper.

George, a cofounder of Fiserv, Inc., has played an integral role in making this company one of the largest data processing firms for financial institutions in the United States. Fiserv, Inc., now serves more than 5,000 financial institutions and has operations in 62 cities world wide. In the last decade, Fiserv, Inc., has grown from fewer than 300 employees with revenues of \$24 million to 6,700 employees with year-end 1994 revenues of \$563 million.

I am proud of the contributions George has made to Wisconsin and the Nation and am pleased to have their opportunity to congratulate him on winning this award. ●

**EXPORTATION OF ALASKAN
NORTH SLOPE CRUDE OIL**

• Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I would like to express my deep concern about S. 395, and other similar legislation which would permit the exportation of Alaskan North Slope crude oil. Lifting the ban would cause severe economic strain in Oregon and Washington, and could raise the Nation's gas prices as well as jeopardize national security.

In 1973, Congress passed legislation authorizing construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. As part of the agreement, we required that none of the Alaska North Slope crude be exported unless the President and Congress found that it was in the national interest to do so. In imposing this restriction, we made sure that no individual oil company would decide that their interest in profit was more important than the national interest to preserve our economy and our national security.

Congress is being asked, by the sponsors of S. 395, to lift the restriction. Mr. President, I understand the potential for significant economic benefits for both Alaska, and the oil industry, if this ban were lifted. The economics are simple to follow. Alaska receives money from oil produced in the State based upon the wellhead price. The

wellhead price is figured at a price less transportation. Thus, the lower the transportation cost, the more money Alaska will receive. If the oil can be transported to Korea, as it can without the restriction, cheaper than it can be transported to the United States, exports will generate more revenue for Alaska.

My primary concern is that, while lifting the export restriction will enhance Alaska's oil-rich economy, this comes at the expense of thousands of lost American jobs and a weakened domestic tanker fleet, all with particular impact in my home State.

Passage of the 1973 export restriction on Alaskan North Slope oil ensured that U.S. repaired vessels would be carrying U.S. crude oil. In 1976, realizing the increase in the demand for large repair facilities, citizens of Portland invested \$84 million in a shipyard expansion program to handle the repair needs for the Alaskan north Slope very large crude carriers. Today, 60 percent of Portland's current ship repair work comes from these tankers. The 1973 restriction reassured Portland that there was a market out there for shipbuilding repair, and Portlanders took a big risk in providing this market. Today, between 500 to 800 family wage jobs in Portland have been directly supported by the repair needs of these large crude oil tankers, on top of another 1,000 jobs that are indirectly connected to the port's tanker repair activities.

S. 395 does have a provision which makes it mandatory that any tanker used to export Alaskan oil would be U.S. owned and operated. And according to U.S. maritime law, any U.S. flagged vessel seeking repairs overseas would be assessed an ad valorem penalty of 50 percent of the repair cost. While this sounds as though U.S. ships would have a disincentive to seek overseas repairs, this simply will not happen. Not only are loopholes available where virtually any tanker can seek an exemption from the 50 percent assessment penalty, but because the U.S. ship repair industry is faced with strict labor laws, environmental compliance laws, minimum wage standards, and labor union demands, it is still more cost effective, even with the penalty, to seek repairs overseas in markets where no strict compliances exist. In addition, according to the new shipbuilding agreement being prepared by the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, we may even lose the right to assess an ad valorem 50 percent penalty. Nevertheless, with or without penalty, S. 395 serves to increase the incentive to repair ships in foreign yards by making it possible for ships to take revenue-producing cargoes of Alaskan North Slope oil to the Far East prior to undergoing repair. This incentive to seek repairs overseas will not only cause serious environmental risks, but will virtually destroy the ship repair industry in Portland, as well as the rest of the entire west coast. As many as 10,000 maritime and

shipyard jobs could be lost. Let me be crystal clear, there is no true disincentive to seek repairs in foreign ports by U.S. tankers. As a result, we will witness the demise of the U.S. tanker repair industry in Oregon.

Furthermore, lifting the restriction could increase our vulnerability to outside influence on U.S. foreign policy. Our Nation may become more exposed to foreign pressures, particularly from the volatile Middle Eastern nations. This poses a great danger to our ability to successfully maintain our independence in global politics.

Mr. President, in conclusion, there is no doubt that lifting this export restriction will hurt the American merchant fleet. It is going to hurt the ship repair yards on the west coast, it is going to raise the cost of crude oil to the United States, it is going to threaten our national security, and it is going to cost thousands and thousands of American jobs, particularly in Oregon. I do not find this to be in the national interest, and I am confident that my colleagues will concur.●

TRIBUTE TO KRISTEN AND SKIP AVANSINO

● Mr. REID. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 11, Kristen and Raymond "Skip" Avansino will be honored by the American Jewish Committee's Institute of Human Relations for their efforts to protect the religious, political, and economic rights of all Americans.

It is with pleasure that I take this occasion to recognize and commend them for their many years of service to the people of Nevada and throughout the country.

Skip Avansino has had a long and remarkable career, and is a role model for all young people who wish to succeed in public and private life. After graduating from the University of Nevada, Reno, Skip earned a degree in law from the University of San Francisco and a masters of law in taxation from New York University.

He returned to the University of Nevada as an assistant professor of business, real estate, and accounting law. Following a 4-year term on the Nevada Gaming Commission, Skip entered private practice specializing in corporate tax and gaming law. In the mid-1980's, Skip's talents were recognized by the Hilton Hotel Corp. and he was appointed to the corporations board of directors.

In February 1993, he was elected president and chief operating officer of Hilton Hotels where he is responsible for overseeing one of the largest resort/casino operations in the world.

Kristen Avansino is equally talented. An accomplished dancer and choreographer, Kristen has served as professor of dance at the University of Nevada, Reno, and as an instructor for the Nevada Museum of Art. She earned a bachelor's and master's degree from Mills College and a lifetime teaching credential from the University of California.

Currently, she is on the board of trustees of the San Francisco Ballet, the Cate School, the Nevada Museum of Art, and she is the executive director of the Wiegand Foundation, a private charitable trust. Indeed, she has lent her talent and energy to many causes in philanthropy, higher education, and the arts.

Kristen and Skip Avansino have been good friends for many years. They have given unselfishly to civic and community causes and have always been willing to give help when help was needed.

I am glad to share with the rest of the country what we in Nevada have known for a long time, and to congratulate the Avansino's for a lifetime of dedication and concern for their fellow citizens.●

TRIBUTE TO NASHVILLE'S YOUTH HOBBY SHOP

● Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I commend the work of two Nashvillians whose efforts to help inner-city children have often gone unrecognized—Glenn and Tara McLain. As directors for the Lindsley location of Nashville's Youth Hobby Shop, Glenn and Tara McLain have worked to provide a positive role model and change the lives of inner-city youth, one by one.

In an area where violence and poverty prevent children from achieving their dreams, the McLains have tutored more than 100 children each week in the Youth Hobby Shop and have worked to keep the kids off of drugs. In addition, they serve as counselors and friends for many of the children and teenagers who participate in the many activities at the Lindsley hobby shop location. As a result, many of these people involved in Youth Hobby Shop stay in school, enter college, or join the work force. Mr. President, this program is changing the lives of our young Americans, and in turn, is helping to change the direction of this country toward a more independent, self-sufficient, and productive society.

When it was founded more than 36 years ago, the Youth Hobby Shop used hobbies and crafts to help children in Nashville who could not help themselves—those who had no one to come home to after school or needed alternatives to the dangerous streets. As the needs of inner-city children have changed, so has the program. Now Youth Hobby Shop provides tutoring in a variety of subjects, as well as drug prevention programs, parenting classes, field trips, summer camps, and a first-rate basketball league to keep the children off the street and guide them toward productive futures.

A recent survey of residents living within a mile radius of both Youth Hobby Shop locations found that 79 percent of the households knew of the hobby shop's programs and spoke highly of them. The survey also suggested areas in which the program could expand, including adding job training and a neighborhood child care service.

Volunteerism is a key to the great success of this program. Most of the hobby shop's funding comes from donations from individuals, corporations, and churches—and Glenn and Tara McLain have not only won the support of children in the Lindsley Avenue neighborhood, but they have attracted the support of more than 75 university students and adults who volunteer regularly to help the kids improve their reading skills. At the beginning and end of each school year, the children's reading skills are tested to measure their progress.

Glenn and Tara McLain have dedicated their lives to helping inner-city children, and for that, Mr. President, I want to thank them. The success of their hard work and dedication is immeasurable and their impact on the city of Nashville is invaluable.●

BURUNDI: ON THE BRINK OF DISASTER

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Central African nation of Burundi is once again on the brink of disaster. Exactly 1 year after the world witnessed a genocide in Rwanda, and 1½ years after ethnic violence between Hutus and Tutsis killed more than 100,000 people in Burundi, we are watching a similar catastrophe unfold before our eyes again. We must do what we can to try to deter another bloodbath.

After months of a tense calm in Burundi, political violence began escalating in the last several weeks as extremist Tutsi militia, with the complicity of the Tutsi-dominated military establishment, stepped up attacks against Hutus, and Hutu extremists prepared for military activity. The violence directly threatens the power-sharing agreement negotiated in September 1993, and disrupts what we all had hoped would be a transition to coexistence in Burundi.

In the last couple of weeks, Amnesty International reports that hundreds of people have been killed or disappeared in Burundi, and thousands of Hutus have fled their villages to seek refuge in Zaire and elsewhere. Some are being held hostage in their own villages, surrounded by hostile armed youths and cut off from outside contact. Rwandan refugees who sought refuge in Burundi last year are now beginning to flee to Zaire and Tanzania out of fear that similar terror will prevail in the refugee camps.

The latest round of violence comes on the heels of the assassination in early March of the Minister for Mines and Energy, Ernest Kabushemeye, a Hutu leader, and the discovery of the dismembered body of a retired Tutsi army officer, Lt. Col. Lucien Sakubo. A week later, 17 more, including 3 Belgians and a 4-year-old child, were killed in a highway ambush by Hutu extremists outside of Bujumbura. Last weekend, at least 200 people were killed

in the capital, according to Amnesty, and more than 100 people were found dead, lying along a rural road south of Bujumbura.

The situation in Burundi has so deteriorated that families of American and European diplomats are being urged to leave. After initially resisting such guidance, the dependents of the United States Ambassador to Burundi, Robert Krueger, also left this week.

The Prime Minister of Burundi, Antoine Nduwayo, has issued a plan of action designed to strengthen law and order in Burundi, and the majority leader of the Burundian Parliament, Bubugive, is traveling throughout Africa to coordinate regional efforts to help Burundi. We should be prepared to offer any support we can for these diplomatic initiatives.

Mr. President, the U.N. Special Representative, Ahmedou Ould Abdallah, has told the Associated Press that "this country * * * is headed toward collision with disaster." And, in reaction to the violent sweeps of Hutu neighborhoods by Tutsi gangs last weekend, Burundi's President, Sylvestre Ntibantunganya, predicted, "I really see a genocide, because those things were well prepared and carried out fairly systematically."

Genocide is a loaded word, and I use it very carefully and sparingly. Given the past events, Burundi's current crisis could explode into a second genocide in Africa within a year.

President Clinton has taken a personal interest in Burundi, broadcasting a plea over Voice of America to the people of Burundi to "say no to violence and extremism." National Security Adviser Tony Lake and Secretary of State Christopher have called for diplomatic intervention. Our Ambassador to Burundi has done a stellar job at communicating the dangers and involving himself where appropriate. I admire and thank him for his commitment.

As events were worsening this week, U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali proposed that a U.N. peacekeeping force be earmarked for intervention so that if there is a need, troops can be promptly deployed.

Last week, the U.N. Security Council also issued a warning that those responsible for ethnic violence in Burundi could eventually be tried in international courts for crimes against humanity. I was encouraged by this since I, along with the Senator from Kansas, Senator KASSEBAUM, chair of the Africa subcommittee, and 10 of our colleagues sent a letter to our Ambassador to the United Nations, Ambassador Madeleine Albright, urging her to support the request made by the Government of Burundi to the U.N. Security Council to establish a judicial commission of experts. This commission would be essential to investigating those who have committed past human rights violations, and could serve as a deterrent for others. If extremists who perpetuate ethnic violence in Burundi

go unpunished, further violence would only be encouraged.

Wednesday marks the anniversary of the beginning of the genocide in Rwanda. The Subcommittees on African Affairs of both the House and the Senate will hold a joint hearing on Central Africa. I urge my colleagues to pay attention to this hearing because we will hear testimony on the aftermath of last year's violence, and examine options to avert another catastrophe this year. I also expect we will discuss how American initiatives, such as the African Conflict Resolution Act, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Illinois and past chair of the subcommittee, Senator SIMON, can help avoid future tragedies.

Our national attention is properly turned to rescissions, constitutional amendments, and other pressing domestic matters now. But we would be remiss to ignore disaster elsewhere because it will come back to haunt us. We may be called upon to contribute money and supplies for humanitarian relief; or support U.N. troops deployed to quell the rampant, sickening violence; or deal with destabilization in Africa because of a massive refugee spillover; or we may face other unforeseen long-term consequences, such as threats to our health, environment, food supplies, and who knows what, if we completely ignore Central Africa.

I urge my colleagues to join us in confronting the complicated problems in Central Africa, and to consider the price we may pay—not to mention the humanitarian disaster that may result—if we pretend Africa does not exist.●

TRIBUTE TO PAUL SAUCEDO

● Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize one of Nevada's outstanding citizens, who, through a courageous act has given another person a chance to live. It is my privilege today to honor a man from Carson City, Paul Saucedo.

In 1989, Paul was diagnosed with Hepatitis C he believes was contracted from a blood transfusion. His condition began to deteriorate and soon, the disease had scarred his liver so badly he began to suffer from increased pain and mental confusion. In 1994, Paul was hospitalized a half-a-dozen times. Paul soon had to retire as an engineer at the Nevada Department of Transportation, because he was too tired during his illness to do much of anything. Last summer, he was given a 30 percent chance of survival. A liver transplant was needed to save Paul's life.

In August of last year, California Pacific Medical Center in San Francisco contacted Paul and informed him a liver was available. When both Paul and his wife learned of a baby girl in the hospital that also needed a liver, Paul decided to give it to the little girl. Even though doctors gave him little chance of surviving another year,

Paul never expressed regret about passing the first donated liver to the little girl.

Another liver was finally available in early February and Paul underwent a successful 15 hour transplant surgery. Paul, is now at his home in Carson City doing well. Through his story, Paul has sparked interest in the donor program and blood drives in northern Nevada.

Paul could have chosen to take the first donated liver to save his own life. Instead, he chose to put a little girl's life ahead of his own. Paul's altruism serves as an inspiration to all of us. I wish him well in the future and commend him for his heroic act.●

APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to public law 83-29, as amended by public law 98-459 and 102-375, reappoints Robert L. Goldman, of Oklahoma, to the Federal Council on the Aging.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, appoints the following Senators to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM].

COMMENDING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALLEN UNIVERSITY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of Senate Resolution 99, relative to the Allen University in Columbia, SC; that it be agreed to; and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to submit today a resolution commending Allen University in Columbia, SC, which is in the midst of a year-long celebration of its 125th anniversary.

In 1870, Bishop John Mifflin Brown and the people of the Columbia Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church established a school for the education of newly-freed slaves in Cokesbury, SC, naming the school for the predecessor to Bishop Brown, Bishop Daniel Alexander Payne. The school was later relocated to Columbia, SC and in 1880, it was renamed for Bishop Richard Allen, the founder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Allen University has a long tradition of producing clergy and lay leadership for the African Methodist Episcopal Church, as well as scholars, attorneys, physicians, teachers, business and governmental leaders, and other professionals who have risen to prominent positions in our society.

I hope my colleagues will join me in commending Allen University and extending our best wishes to the university under the leadership of Bishop John Hurst Adams and President David T. Shannon.

So the resolution (S. Res. 99) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 99

Whereas Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina, is in the midst of a year-long celebration of the 125th anniversary of the University;

Whereas Allen University has produced local and national leaders who have served communities and the United States in an exemplary way;

Whereas the late Bishop John Mifflin Brown and the people of the Columbia Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church had the vision to establish a school for the education of newly freed slaves in 1870 in Cokesbury, South Carolina, naming the school for the predecessor to Bishop Brown, Bishop Daniel Alexander Payne, and appointing Professor J.W. Morris as president;

Whereas Bishop William F. Dickerson led a successful effort to relocate the school to Columbia, South Carolina, and rename the school in 1880 for Bishop Richard Allen, the founder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, while the Reverend James C. Waters assumed the presidency;

Whereas the University has a long tradition of producing clergy and lay leadership for the African Methodist Episcopal Church;

Whereas the University has produced numerous scholars, attorneys, physicians, teachers, and business and governmental leaders, and other professionals who have risen to positions of notoriety in the African-American community as a whole;

Whereas Doctor Margaret Dixon is an exemplary Allen University Alumnae who has recently been elected as president of American Association of Retired People;

Whereas the University has endured all the difficulties familiar to historically black colleges and universities;

Whereas the University, with an historic campus, is an accredited member institution of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools;

Whereas the University, under the present leadership of Bishop John Hurst Adams and President David T. Shannon, is equipped to serve non-traditional students and others who would otherwise not have the opportunity for a college education, as well as remaining faithful to the traditional goals of the University of clergy and leadership education; and

Whereas the University still strives to live up to the motto of the University, which is "Heads to Think, Hands to Work, and Hearts to Love": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress—

(1) commends Allen University for 125 years of progress, commitment, and dedication in the shaping of productive lives; and

(2) extends best wishes to Allen University and hopes for the University will have a pro-

ductive future that continues the accomplishments of the past.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of the following nominations on the Executive Calendar, en bloc: Calendar Nos. 52-62 and 64-66, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk.

Further, that the nominations be confirmed, en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc; and that any statements relating to the nominations appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations were considered and confirmed, en bloc, as follows:

AIR FORCE

The following-named officer for appointment to the grade of general on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be general

Gen. Ronald W. Yates, 000-00-0000, U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer for reappointment to the grade of general while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be general

Gen. Henry Viccaglio, Jr., 000-00-0000, U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer for reappointment to the grade of lieutenant general while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Billy J. Boles, 000-00-0000, U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer for reappointment to the grade of lieutenant general while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, section 601.

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Eugene E. Habiger, 000-00-0000, U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Lawrence P. Farrell, Jr., 000-00-0000, U.S. Air Force.

The following-officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of Sections 593, 8373, and 8374, and 12004, title 10, United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Louis A. Crigler, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Terrance L. Dake, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Robert A. Nester, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Reese R. Nielsen, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Ralph H. Oates, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier general

Col. Louis C. Ferraro, Jr., 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Clayton T. Gadd, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Walter T. Hatcher III, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Robert A. Krell, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Sharon K. Mailey, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. James L. Martin, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Wayne L. Pritz, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Edward F. Rodriquez, Jr., 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Dennis W. Schulstad, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Lawrence F. Sheehan, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Larry L. Twitchell, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Ernest R. Webster, 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Geoffrey P. Wiedeman, Jr., 000-00-0000, Air Force Reserve.

The following-named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James A. Fain, Jr., 000-00-0000, U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general of the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John M. Nowak, 000-00-0000, U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. George T. Babbitt, Jr., 000-00-0000, U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Glynn C. Mallory, Jr., 000-00-0000, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Daniel R. Schroeder, 000-00-0000, U.S. Army.

NAVY

The following-named officer for appointment to the grade of Admiral while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, sections 601 and 5035:

VICE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Joseph W. Prueher, 000-00-0000, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer for appointment to the grade of Vice Admiral while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Donald L. Pilling, 000-00-0000, U.S. Navy.

MARINE CORPS

The following-named colonel of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve for promotion to the grade of brigadier general, under the provisions of section 5912 of title 10, United States Code:

To be brigadier general

Col. Stephen M. Engelhardt, 000-00-0000.

The following-named colonels of the U.S. Marine Corps for promotion to the permanent grade of brigadier general, under the provisions of section 624 of title 10, United States Code:

To be brigadier general

Col. Charles F. Bolden, Jr., 000-00-0000.

Col. James M. Hayes, 000-00-0000.

Col. Randall L. West, 000-00-0000.

Col. Michael W. Hagee, 000-00-0000.

Col. Wallace C. Gregson, Jr., 000-00-0000.

Col. Garry L. Parks, 000-00-0000.

Col. Martin R. Berndt, 000-00-0000.

Col. Dennis T. Krupp, 000-00-0000.

Col. Michael A. Hough, 000-00-0000.

Col. Henry P. Osman, 000-00-0000.

Col. Paul M. Lee, Jr., 000-00-0000.

Col. Edward R. Langston, Jr., 000-00-0000.

Col. Jerry D. Humble, 000-00-0000.

Col. Jan C. Huly, 000-00-0000.

IN THE AIR FORCE, ARMY, MARINE CORPS, NAVY

Air Force nominations beginning Harold L. Kennedy, and ending Douglas D. Taylor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, 1995.

Air Force nominations beginning Thomas A. Work, and ending Quay C. Snyder, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1995.

Air Force nominations beginning Maj. Lawrence R. Dowling, 000-00-0000, and ending Maj. Ellen N. Thomas, 000-00-0000, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1995.

Air Force nominations beginning Maj. Michael M. Adkinson, 000-00-0000, and ending Maj. Sheldon R. Omi, 000-00-0000, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1995.

Air Force nominations beginning Norman W. Anderson, and ending Darin L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1995.

Air Force nominations beginning James M. Corrigan, and ending John A. Stahl, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1995.

Air Force nominations beginning Saket K. Ambasht, and ending Randall C. Zernzach, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1995.

Air Force nominations beginning Carl M. Alley, and ending Roberta L. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 6, 1995.

Air Force nominations beginning Roberta L. Fierro, and ending Stephen D. Hess, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1995.

Army nominations beginning Orin R. Hilmo, Jr., and ending Stephen C. Wallace, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, 1995.

Army nominations beginning Richard G. Austin, and ending William D. McGowin, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1995.

Army nominations beginning Gary D. Bray, and ending William T. Sherer III which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1995.

Army nominations beginning Ben W. Adams, Jr., and ending Richard D. Ligon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1995.

Army nomination of Milton D. Hughes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 22, 1995.

Army nominations beginning Peter P. Baljet, and ending Stephen A. Greene, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1995.

Army nominations beginning Jack N. Anderson, and ending Karl K. Willoughby, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1995.

Army nominations beginning Duane B. Anderson, and ending James J. Welch, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1995.

Army nominations beginning Arthur D. Bacon, and ending Jon M. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1995.

Army nominations beginning Andre E. Adams, and ending William Zekas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1995.

Army nomination of David C. Chuber, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 6, 1995.

Army nominations beginning Joseph L. Walden, and ending Richard A. Logan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14, 1995.

Army nominations beginning Douglas M. Anderson, and ending Steven Wonderlich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14, 1995.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Lawrence J. Kovalchik, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, 1995.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Brandon D. Brown, and ending Steven M. Wolf, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1995.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Capt. Donovan E.V. Bryan, and ending Capt. Christopher J. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1995.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Jonathan M. Aadland, and ending Walter Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1995.

Navy nomination of Sergey M. Scollan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, 1995.

Navy nominations beginning Kerby E. Rich, and ending Lawrence W. Wiggins, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1995.

Navy nominations beginning Eric R. Vic-tory, and ending Robert L. Stewart, which

nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1995.

Navy nominations beginning Amy L. Digiovanni, and ending Mark S. Spitzer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1995.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1995

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 4, 1995; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that there then be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 10:30 with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with the exception of the following: Senator THOMAS for up to 30 minutes; Senator DASCHLE or his designee for up to 30 minutes.

I further ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 10:30, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1158, the supplemental appropriations bill; and that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly party luncheons to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the supplemental appropriations tomorrow morning at 10:30. Therefore, rollcall votes are expected throughout the day on Tuesday.

Members are also reminded to be in the Chamber at 2:15 p.m. tomorrow for the official photograph of the 104th Congress.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks by the Senator from South Dakota, the Senate stand in recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS BILL

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I would like to report to the Senate on

the status of the telecommunications bill. On March 23, the Commerce Committee voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995.

It is my strongest hope now that we can get this bill up for action on the floor this week, before the recess. The danger in delay is that it could be picked apart by the various interest groups.

This bill would be a roadmap for investment for the next 15 years, until the wireless age. There will be an explosion of investment if we pass it. The benefits to consumers will be tremendous.

I wish to urge Members of the Senate and the various interests and consumer groups that are lobbying and working on this bill to remember that if we give one group a special consideration, then we have to give it to others.

It seems that everybody wants to have a bill. CEO's all say they want a bill; the administration wants a bill. But we will not have a bill unless we have some cooperation and everyone working together. That has been my message.

So I do hope we get the telecommunications bill up this week. If not, we will pass it later—but it is far better to act sooner than later. I would implore the various interests in this country which are following this bill to work together. This is the sort of bill that is not on every American citizen's mind every day, but I think it is the most important bill for our country's economy in the Congress today. It is up to those of us in the Senate and the House and the White House to work together cooperatively. I look forward to doing that.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, at 7:33 p.m., recessed until Tuesday, April 4, 1995, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 3, 1995:

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

VERA ALEXANDER, OF ALASKA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 13, 1997, VICE JACK WARREN LENTFER, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 12203 AND 8379, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, PROMOTIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 8379 AND CONFIRMED BY THE SENATE UNDER SECTION 12203 SHALL BEAR AN EFFECTIVE DATE ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 8374, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

BRADLEY C. ANDRESEN, 000-00-0000
JOHN M. CAVENDISH, 000-00-0000
ROBERT B. DEEBEL, 000-00-0000
PETER L. FARIS, 000-00-0000

CHRIS R. GLAESER, 000-00-0000
MARK H. HULSEY, 000-00-0000
THOMAS F. KEATING, 000-00-0000
JOHN T. MCDERMOTT, 000-00-0000
TIMOTHY C. MORRIS, 000-00-0000
JOE A. ROSE, JR., 000-00-0000
CHARLES R. SENCINDIVER, 000-00-0000
DONALD B. SIMS, 000-00-0000
JERRY D. STEVENS, 000-00-0000
JOHN R. TUTTLE, 000-00-0000
SMILEY J. VEAL, 000-00-0000
GEORGE A. WASKOSKY, 000-00-0000

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERALS DEPARTMENT

To be lieutenant colonel

DEAN A. ARNOLD, 000-00-0000

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL J. SHEA, 000-00-0000

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES R. BURKHART, 000-00-0000

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

OSVALDO COLLAZO, 000-00-0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

CHARLES E. LOWREY, 000-00-0000

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 12203 AND 8379, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, PROMOTIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 8379 SHALL BEAR AN EFFECTIVE DATE ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 8374, TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSE T. AGUINEGA, 000-00-0000
KENNETH E. BERGGREN, 000-00-0000
MICHAEL R. BOULANGER, 000-00-0000
JAMES A. CAPORINI, 000-00-0000
SCOTT L. DONALDSON, 000-00-0000
RUSSELL G. ERLER, 000-00-0000
GEHL L. HAMMOND, 000-00-0000
CRAIG E. HARRIMAN, 000-00-0000
WILLIAM L. LEVAY, 000-00-0000
FRANK SARCONI, 000-00-0000
CRAIG E. WALLACE, 000-00-0000

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERALS DEPARTMENT

To be lieutenant colonel

KEVIN FINNIGAN, 000-00-0000
VICTORIA A. REARDON, 000-00-0000

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

THOMAS E. KINNEY, 000-00-0000
DAVID L. VAIL, 000-00-0000

MEDICAL SERVICES CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

JAMES B. HINSON, 000-00-0000

BIOMEDICAL SERVICES CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

BAXTER D. BURTON, 000-00-0000
ERNEST D. GREEN, 000-00-0000

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT J. LYNCH, 000-00-0000
PAUL E. RECKARD, 000-00-0000
JOHN G. SOTOS, 000-00-0000

NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

STEPHEN L. JERENTOWSKI, 000-00-0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANT COLONELS OF THE U.S. MARINE CORPS FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF COLONEL, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 624 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

To be colonel

ALAUZIA, ANTHONY T., 000-00-0000
ALLEN, PAUL C., 000-00-0000
BAIN, WILLIAM F., 000-00-0000
BAMFORD II, RENO C., 000-00-0000
BARNHOUSE, THOMAS N., 000-00-0000
BARTH, WILLIAM M., 000-00-0000
BEAULIEU, RAYMOND, 000-00-0000
BERUBE, RONALD A., 000-00-0000
BLACKLEDGE, MATTHEW W., 000-00-0000
BROOKS, MICHAEL A., 000-00-0000
BUDKA, ANDREW J., 000-00-0000
CARR, EDGAR B., 000-00-0000
CATTO, WILLIAM D., 000-00-0000

CLAUER, JOHN A., 000-00-0000
CLIFTON, DAVID R., 000-00-0000
CONWAY, TIMOTHY C., 000-00-0000
CROOKSTON, JOSEPH A., 000-00-0000
CUSHING JR., JOHN P., 000-00-0000
DAVIS, JACK G., 000-00-0000
DOMARASKY III, ANDREW M., 000-00-0000
DULIN, PATRICK J., 000-00-0000
EINSIDLER, MICHAEL A., 000-00-0000
FARMER, LEE H., 000-00-0000
FARMER, ROGER T., 000-00-0000
FORTE, ROBERT T., 000-00-0000
GARRETT, WILLIAM B., 000-00-0000
GISOLO, GARY G., 000-00-0000
GRAHAM JR., JOHN W., 000-00-0000
HALTON, PATRICK K., 000-00-0000
HAMILTON, RICHARD D., 000-00-0000
HARLIN JR., DONALD V., 000-00-0000
HELLAND, SAMUEL T., 000-00-0000
HENDRICKSON, LEIF H., 000-00-0000
HOFFER, NICHOLAS J., 000-00-0000
HOGAN, JOHN J., 000-00-0000
JEPSSEN, NORMAN W., 000-00-0000
JOHN, DAVID L., 000-00-0000
JONES, JOSEPH B., 000-00-0000
KARLE, JR., ALFRED J., 000-00-0000
KIFFER, DAVID L., 000-00-0000
KRAMLICH, RICHARD S., 000-00-0000
KRUMM, FRED A., 000-00-0000
LARSEN, LEIF R., 000-00-0000
LARSEN, TIMOTHY R., 000-00-0000
LARSON, LAWRENCE L., 000-00-0000
LEAVIS, JAMES M., 000-00-0000
LEMOINE, JOHN A., 000-00-0000
LENNOX, DYER T., 000-00-0000
LONG, DENNIS E., 000-00-0000
MAISEL, GREGORY N., 000-00-0000
MARTIN JR., JOSEPH, 000-00-0000
MCDANIEL, DANNY J., 000-00-0000
MULLIN, PATRICK J., 000-00-0000
NANGLE, ORVAL E., 000-00-0000
PATTON, TOMMY L., 000-00-0000
PELLICONE, JOHN J., 000-00-0000
PERRY, MICHAEL T., 000-00-0000
QUINLAN, MICHAEL J., 000-00-0000
RICHARDSON, DONALD A., 000-00-0000
ROAN, RICHARD W., 000-00-0000
ROWLAND, ROBERT O., 000-00-0000
SCHLAICH, NORMAN G., 000-00-0000
SCHLEINING JR., JAMES E., 000-00-0000
SCOVILL III, CALVIN L., 000-00-0000
STEWART, FRANK M., 000-00-0000
STEWART, JOE R., 000-00-0000
THOMAS, JOHNNY R., 000-00-0000
TIMOTHY, EUGENE R., 000-00-0000
TRACY, PHILIP D., 000-00-0000
TRIPLETT, MITCHEL T., 000-00-0000
WHITE III, THOMAS B., 000-00-0000
WILLIAMS, THOMAS J., 000-00-0000
WOODSON, THOMAS S., 000-00-0000

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 3, 1995:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL ON THE RETIRED LIST PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be general

GEN. RONALD W. YATES, 000-00-0000.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. HENRY VICCELLIO, JR., 000-00-0000.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. BILLY J. BOLES, 000-00-0000.
LT. GEN. EUGENE E. HABIGER, 000-00-0000.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LAWRENCE P. FARRELL, JR., 000-00-0000.

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 593, 8373, 8374, AND 12004, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

AIR FORCE RESERVE

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. LOUIS A. CRIGLER, 000-00-0000.
BRIG. GEN. TERRENCE L. DAKE, 000-00-0000.
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT A. NESTER, 000-00-0000.
BRIG. GEN. REESE R. NIELSEN, 000-00-0000.

BRIG. GEN. RALPH H. OATES, 000-00-0000.

AIR FORCE RESERVE
To be brigadier general

COL. LOUIS C. FERRARO, JR., 000-00-0000.
COL. CLAYTON T. GADD, 000-00-0000.
COL. WALTER T. HATCHER III, 000-00-0000.
COL. ROBERT A. KRELL, 000-00-0000.
COL. SHARON K. MAILEY, 000-00-0000.
COL. JAMES L. MARTIN, 000-00-0000.
COL. WAYNE L. PRITZ, 000-00-0000.
COL. EDWARD F. RODRIQUEZ, JR., 000-00-0000.
COL. DENNIS W. SCHULSTAD, 000-00-0000.
COL. LAWRENCE F. SHEEHAN, 000-00-0000.
COL. LARRY L. TWITCHELL, 000-00-0000.
COL. ERNEST R. WEBSTER, 000-00-0000.
COL. GEOFFREY P. WIEDEMAN, JR., 000-00-0000.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL ON THE RETIRED LIST PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JAMES A. FAIN, JR., 000-00-0000.
LT. GEN. JOHN M. NOWAK, 000-00-0000.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GEORGE T. BABBITT, JR., 000-00-0000.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING HAROLD L. KENNEDY, AND ENDING DOUGLAS D. TAYLOR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 3, 1995.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING THOMAS A. WORK, AND ENDING QUAY C. SNYDER, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 1995.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING MAJ. LAWRENCE R. DOWLING, 000-00-0000 AND ENDING MAJ. ELLEN N. THOMAS, 000-00-0000, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 1995.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING MAJ. MICHAEL M. ADKINSON, 000-00-0000, AND ENDING MAJ. SHELDON R. OMI, 000-00-0000, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 1995.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING NORMAN W. ANDERSON, AND ENDING DARIN L. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 1995.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JAMES M. CORRIGAN, AND ENDING JOHN A. STAHL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 1995.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING SAKET K. AMBASHT, AND ENDING RANDALL C. ZERNZACH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 16, 1995.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING CARL M. ALLEY, AND ENDING ROBERTA L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS

WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 6, 1995.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING ROBERTA L. FIERRO, AND ENDING STEPHEN D. HESS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 8, 1995.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. GLYNN C. MALLORY, JR., 000-00-0000
LT. GEN. DANIEL R. SCHROEDER, 000-00-0000

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING ORIN R. HILMO, JR., AND ENDING STEPHEN C. WALLACE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 3, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING RICHARD G. AUSTIN, AND ENDING WILLIAM D. MCGOWIN, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING GARY D. BRAY, AND ENDING WILLIAM T. SHERER III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING BEN W. ADAMS, JR., AND ENDING RICHARD D. LIGON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 16, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MILTON D. HUGHES, WHICH WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 22, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING PETER P. BALJET, AND ENDING STEPHEN A. GREENE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 27, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JACK N. ANDERSON, AND ENDING KARL K. WILLOUGHBY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 27, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING DUANE B. ANDERSON, AND ENDING JAMES J. WELCH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 27, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING ARTHUR D. BACON, AND ENDING JON M. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 27, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING ANDREW E. ADAMS, AND ENDING WILLIAM ZEKAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 27, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID C. CHUBER, WHICH WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 6, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JOSEPH L. WALDEN, AND ENDING RICHARD A. LOGAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 14, 1995.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING DOUGLAS M. ANDERSON, AND ENDING STEVEN WONDERLICH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 14, 1995.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF VICE ADMIRAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A

POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. DONALD L. PHILLING, 000-00-0000

NAVY NOMINATION OF SERGEY M. SCOLLAN, WHICH WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JANUARY 6, 1995.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING KERBY E. RICH, AND ENDING LAWRENCE W. WIGGINS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 1995.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING ERIC R. VICTORY, AND ENDING ROBERT L. STEWART, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 8, 1995.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING AMY L. DIGIOVANNI, AND ENDING MARK S. SPITZER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 8, 1995.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED COLONEL OF THE U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVE FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 5912 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

To be brigadier general

COL. STEPHEN M. ENGELHARDT, 000-00-0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED COLONELS OF THE U.S. MARINE CORPS FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 624 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHARLES F. BOLDEN, JR., 000-00-0000
COL. JAMES M. HAYES, 000-00-0000
COL. RANDALL L. WEST, 000-00-0000
COL. MICHAEL W. HAGEE, 000-00-0000
COL. WALLACE C. GREGSON, JR., 000-00-0000
COL. GARRY L. PARKS, 000-00-0000
COL. MARTIN R. BERNDT, 000-00-0000
COL. DENNIS T. KRUPP, 000-00-0000
COL. MICHAEL A. HOUGH, 000-00-0000
COL. HENRY P. OSMAN, 000-00-0000
COL. PAUL M. LEE, JR., 000-00-0000
COL. EDWARD R. LANGSTON, JR., 000-00-0000
COL. JERRY D. HUMBLE, 000-00-0000
COL. JAN C. HULY, 000-00-0000

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF MAJ. LAWRENCE J. KOVALCHIK, WHICH WAS RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF FEBRUARY 3, 1995.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING BRANDON D. BROWN, AND ENDING STEVEN M. WOLF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD FEBRUARY 8, 1995.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING CAPT. DONOVAN E.V. BRYAN, AND ENDING CAPT. CHRISTOPHER J. WAGNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD FEBRUARY 16, 1995.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING JONATHAN M. AADLAND, AND ENDING WALTER YATES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 16, 1995.